

**“Gott stieg hinauf ... ” (Ps 47,6) — wohin?
Psalm 47 als exilische Hoffnung auf Restitution ¹**

Im Zentrum von Psalm 47, in V. 6, wird verkündet: “Es ist hinaufgestiegen Gott begleitet von Lärm, JHWH begleitet vom Klang des Schofars”. Der Vers nennt für das Bewegungsverb עלה keine Richtungsangabe und lässt somit offen, wohin Gott hinaufsteigt². Dies hat in der Forschung dazu geführt, dass ausgehend von V. 6 verschiedene Interpretationen vertreten wurden³.

- a) Der Befund, dass 2 Sam 6,15 mit Ps 47,6 die Worte עלה, תרועה, שופר (vgl. auch Psalm 132) gemein hat, führte zu der Annahme einer hinter dem Text stehenden Kultprozession⁴. S. Mowinckel entwickelte auf der Basis von Psalm 24 und Psalm 47 seine Theorie von dem jährlichen “Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs”⁵.
- b) Da V. 6 den Zielort der Handlung nicht preisgibt, ist es ebenso möglich mit Gen 17,22; Ri 13,20; Pss 7,8; 68,19 das Hinaufsteigen Gottes in Richtung Himmel anzunehmen, “nachdem er sich auf Erden in Thaten der Allmacht und Liebe kundgetan und dort seines Volkes Sache geführt [hat] [...]”⁶.
- c) Es finden sich in der Auslegungsgeschichte auch Versuche, Ps 47,6 historisch (z.B. als Rückkehr aus dem Exil zum Zion)⁷

¹ Der vorliegende Beitrag steht im Zusammenhang mit dem Status des Verfassers als “Research Associate of the Department of Old Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology, at the University of Pretoria”.

² W.A.M. BEUKEN, “Psalm XLVII”, *Remembering All the Way* (ed. B. ALBREKTSON e.a.) (OTS 21; Leiden 1981) 38-54, 43: “Most remarkable is the fact that any adjunct of place is lacking”.

³ Vgl. B. ROSENDAL, “‘Gott ist aufgestiegen’”, *SJOT* 1 (1991) 148-154.

⁴ M. D. GOULDER, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOTSS 20; Sheffield 1982) 156. B. Duhm deutet Ps 47,6 zwar ebenso kultisch, bezieht עלה jedoch nicht auf eine Prozession, sondern auf die Opferhandlung; vgl. B. DUHM, *Die Psalmen* (KHKAT XIV; Tübingen 1922) 194.

⁵ S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalmenstudien II* (Kristiana 1922) 4; vgl. auch 191.

⁶ E.W. HENGSTENBERG, *Commentar über die Psalmen* (Berlin 1843) 450.

⁷ F. BAETHGEN, *Die Psalmen* (HKAT II/2; Göttingen 1897) 133: “Wahrscheinlich will der Dichter unter dem altbekannten Bilde nur dem Gedanken

oder eschatologisch (als Beginn des messianischen Reiches)⁸ zu deuten.

Einen Versuch verschiedene Interpretationen zu vereinigen hat E. Zenger unternommen. Grundlage für seine intra-textuelle Interpretation ist die Annahme des sekundären Charakters von VV. 3-4⁹: “Das ‘Hinaufsteigen’ JHWHs, das in der Grundfassung des Psalms als Explikation des Gottestitels ‘Höchster’ von 3a gemeint war (‘*ʿeljōn* — ‘*ālāh*) und JHWHs urzeitliche Thronbesteigung in seinem himmlischen Palast bezeichnete (vgl. die analoge Vorstellung von Baals Thronbesteigung), ist im jetzigen Textzusammenhang als Rückkehr von der in 4f geschilderten Auseinandersetzung mit den Völkern (vgl. dazu Psalm 46!) und als Inbesitznahme des Zion als Thronszitz durch JHWH zu lesen”¹⁰. In kritischer Auseinandersetzung mit dieser Auslegung von E. Zenger soll im vorliegenden Artikel der Bedeutung von עֲלָה in Ps 47,6 und im gesamten Psalm nachgegangen werden. Es soll eine Antwort gefunden werden auf die Frage: Wohin steigt JHWH hinauf gemäß V. 6? Dementsprechend wird im Folgenden die Struktur von Psalm 47 untersucht (siehe I.) und die theologische Einbindung von V. 6 in Psalm 47 herausgearbeitet (siehe II.-III.), um nach einer Analyse von Psalm 47 die Frage zu beantworten, wohin Gott gemäß Ps 47,6 hinaufsteigt (siehe IV.).

Ausdruck geben, dass Jahve die Herrschaft über Zion angetreten ist. Als Jerusalem eingenommen und zerstört wurde, war er von seinem Throne auf Zion herabgestiegen; bei der Rückkehr aus dem Exil nahm er ihn wieder ein [...]”.

⁸ R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen* (KAT 12; Leipzig 1929) 174.

⁹ Vgl. F.-L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I* (NEB; Würzburg 1993) 289. Seiner Meinung nach sprechen folgende Argumente für den sekundären Charakter von V 3b-5b: 1.) “Als ursprünglicher Teil des Hymnus, den ‘die Völker’ singen sollen, ist 4-5 schlechterdings nicht vorstellbar”. 2.) Während in V. 2 die Völker in determinierter Form genannt werden, verwendet V. 4 keinen Artikel. Meine folgenden Ausführungen werden diesen Argumenten widersprechen.

¹⁰ HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 292.

I. Zur Struktur von Psalm 47

J. Jeremias hat auf die strukturgebende Relevanz der Wortwurzel עלה in Psalm 47 hingewiesen¹¹. Der in V. 3a vorkommende Gottestitel עלין leitet sich von על “Höhe/hochgestellt” ab, und bezeichnet Gott als den Höchsten der Götter. Somit ist dieser Gottestitel eng verbunden mit der Verbwurzel עלה¹². Analog wird der Gott, der als Höchster bezeichnet wird (V. 3a), am Ende des Psalms als “sehr erhaben” (מאד נעלה – V. 10b) gepriesen. Zwischen diesen beiden Aussagen findet sich in V. 6 die im Perfekt formulierte Notiz, dass Gott hinaufgestiegen ist. Ausgehend von diesen drei Vorkommen der Wortwurzel, lässt sich der Psalm in zwei Strophen einteilen, wobei V. 6 als Scharniervers fungiert¹³. Dass in VV. 2.6 eine Rahmung besteht, zeigen die Aufnahme von אלהים, קל, רוע, sowie das Vorkommen des Gottesnamens JHWH in VV. 3.6. Einen zweiten Rahmen bilden VV. 6.10, indem das erste Wort von V. 6a und das letzte Wort von V. 10 jeweils eine Form von עלה darstellen. VV. 2-5 und VV. 7-10 sind parallel aufgebaut¹⁴: Den imperativischen Aufforderungen zur Huldigung (VV. 2.7.8b) folgt ein mit כי eingeleiteter Nominalsatz, der das Lob begründet (VV. 3.8a). In VV. 4-5 und VV. 9-10 schließen sich jeweils den Nominalsatz explizierende Verbalsätze an. Zusätzlich findet sich im letzten Vers der beiden Strophen der Verweis auf ein Eponym Israels (Jakob: V. 5b; Abraham: V. 10a). Während in VV. 2.6 die erste Strophe durch die Nennung der Gottesbezeichnung אלהים gerahmt wird, wird sie in der zweiten Strophe in jedem Vers verwendet (VV. 7.8.9.10).

Neben der strukturierenden Verwendung von עלין/עלה hat J. Jeremias auf die damit eng verbundene Benutzung der Präposition על hingewiesen: “Hinzu kommt noch der doppelte Gebrauch der Präposition על in V. 3b und 9a (‘über die ganze Erde’, ‘über alle Völker’)”¹⁵. Diese Präposition findet sich somit im zweiten und

¹¹ Vgl. J. JEREMIAS, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen* (FRLANT 141; Göttingen 1987) 54.

¹² Vgl. F. STOLZ, *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem* (BZAW 118; Berlin 1970) 134.

¹³ Vgl. J. SCHAPER, “Psalm 47 und sein ‘Sitz im Leben’”, *ZAW* 106 (1994) 264.

¹⁴ Vgl. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 289.

¹⁵ JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 54.

im vorletzten Vers des Psalms. In V. 9 ist sie sogar zweifach belegt: 1.) in der Aussage, dass Gott über alle Völker König geworden ist und 2.) in der Aussage, dass Gott auf dem Thron seiner Heiligkeit sitzt. Die Analyse der Struktur verdeutlicht, dass sich die theologische Botschaft entlang der Verwendung von *על / עלה / עליין* entwickelt.

Entgegen der von mir vertretenen durchstrukturierten einheitlichen Form von Psalm 47 geht E. Zenger von einer zweistufigen Entstehungsgeschichte des Psalms aus. Seiner Meinung nach sind VV. 3b-5.8b.10 sekundär¹⁶. Die von ihm angeführten literarkritischen Argumente sind jedoch nicht stichhaltig und widersprechen sich in der Argumentation selbst. E. Zenger scheidet V 8b als sekundär aus, da durch diesen Teilvers die von ihm postulierte enge Beziehung zwischen V. 8a und V. 9 unterbrochen wird; zudem sei die strukturelle Entsprechung der Aufeinanderfolge von Nominalsatz und Verbalsatz in VV. 3.4 ebenso sekundär, da VV. 4-5 eingefügt seien. Der sekundäre Charakter von VV. 4-5 wird von E. Zenger alleine dadurch begründet, dass diese Verse als „ursprünglicher Teil des Hymnus, den ‘die Völker singen sollen [...]’ schlechterdings nicht vorstellbar“ sei¹⁷. Warum diese Lesart in der Grundschrift nicht möglich sei, jedoch als Redaktion denkbar ist, erklärt er allerdings nicht. Ebenso bleibt offen, warum V. 3b sekundär eingefügt worden sein soll. In meinen folgenden Ausführungen wird der primäre Charakter von VV. 4-5 innerhalb der Analyse von Psalm 47 nachgewiesen, wodurch die sonstigen literarkritischen Annahmen von E. Zenger ihre Wertigkeit verlieren werden.

II. VV. 2-5.6: Warum die Völker jubeln sollen

E. Zenger liest VV. 4-5 als den von den Völkern zu sprechenden Lobpreis Gottes; gemäß V. 2a sind diese die textinternen Adressaten des Psalms (Vokativ: *כל־הַעַמִּים*). Der Aufruf aus VV. 2b, Gott mit der Stimme der Freude zu jauchzen, ergeht auch in Pss 60,10; 66,1; 98,4; 100,1; 108,10 an fremde Völker (vgl. Num 23,21; 1 Sam 10,24). Das Gott-Zujauchzen ist eine in den Psalmen mehrfach wiederkehrende Wendung (vgl. Pss 66,1; 81,2; [95,1.2;] 98,4; 100,1), die jedoch keine direkte Redeeinleitung darstellt und der

¹⁶ Vgl. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 289.

¹⁷ HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 289.

כי-Satz in V. 3 dient nicht als Beginn des Lobpreises sondern als Begründung für den geforderten Jubel¹⁸. Diesen Beobachtungen entspricht im gegebenen Text von Psalm 47, dass a.) den Imperativen in V. 2 nochmals Imperative in VV. 7-8 folgen und b.) dass in V. 8 dem begründenden כי in V. 8b nochmals eine Aufforderung zum Singen folgt. Es besteht somit keine Notwendigkeit VV. 4-5 als zu sprechendes Lob der Völker zu lesen. Eher zeigt V. 6 mit der Verwendung von עלה den explizierenden Charakter von VV. 4-6 an. Die Bezeichnungen bzw. Benennungen Gottes in V. 3 werden in VV. 4-6 erklärt. Eine solche Erklärung führt jedoch zu dem bereits von B. Duhm gesehenen Problem, dass damit die Unterwerfung von Völkern für Israel (V. 4) als Grund zum Jubel für die Völkerwelt angegeben wird¹⁹. Eine zusammenhängende Analyse der ersten Strophe (VV. 2-5) einschließlich des Scharnierverses (V. 6) zeigt jedoch, dass die Unterwerfung von Völkern zugunsten Israels nicht zur Begründung für den geforderten Jubel aller Völker dient.

1. Aufforderung und Begründung (VV. 2-3)

V. 2 stellt eine zweifache Aufforderung dar. Die Anrede an alle Völker stellt mit der Bezeichnung Gottes als König über die gesamte Welt in V. 3b einen Rahmen dar, der die Aufforderung (V. 2) und hymnische Begründung (V. 3) umschließt. Die Aufforderung zum Klatschen der Hände (V. 2a) erfolgt ohne Objekt und stellt die allgemeine Forderung zu “öffentlichen Freudenbezeugungen” dar²⁰. V. 2b richtet die Freude auf Gott aus. Die Begründung der Imperative wird in V. 3 auf dreifache Weise gegeben: a.) JHWH wird als höchster Gott bezeichnet und ihm wird damit der Status der höchsten Macht zugesprochen²¹. b.) Die Bezeichnung JHWHs als

¹⁸ F. CRÜSEMANN, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel* (WMANT 32; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 80, Anm. 5.

¹⁹ Vgl. B. DUHM, *Die Psalmen*, 193.

²⁰ H. HUPFELD, *Die Psalmen II* (Gotha 1867) 382; vgl. noch Neh 3,19 sowie Ps 98,8 und Jes 55,12. Das Klatschen in die Hände ist ein allgemeiner Ausdruck der Freude und wird in 2 Kön 11,12 in Zusammenhang der Königsfreude, der Akklamation des neuen Königs verwendet (vgl. auch Ez 25,6).

²¹ HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 291: “‘Höchster’ (‘*ʾēljōn*’) faßt die Rolle zusammen, die El im Götterpantheon und in der kanaanäischen Weltdeutung hatte”. Vgl. auch die Auslegung zu Ps 97,9 in: F.-L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER (eds.), *Psalmen 51–100* (HThKAT; Freiburg u.a. 2000) 683.

“furchtbar/furchterregend” ist Ausdruck des *mysterium tremendum* und bezeichnet die Handlungsmacht Gottes in der Welt (vgl. Zef 2,11; Pss 76,12; 89,8)²². c.) Abschließend und am ausführlichsten ist die Benennung Gottes als “großer König” über die gesamte Welt²³. J. Schaper hat darauf hingewiesen, dass sich in dieser Bezeichnung die Sehnsucht ausdrückt “nach der Durchsetzung der religiösen und politischen Weltherrschaft des Gottes Israels, nach seinem Antreten des potentiell immer schon vorhandenen universalen Regiments”²⁴. In V. 3b wird Gott als höchste Macht auf Erden bezeichnet (vgl. Sach 14,9). Betrachtet man die dreifache Begründung in V. 3, ergibt sich daraus, dass Gott allumfassend, als höchste himmlische und als höchste weltliche Autorität und Macht dargestellt wird. Dies wird in V. 3b noch dazu in Form eines Nominalsatzes ausgedrückt, wodurch die Charakterisierung Gottes eine zeitliche Entgrenzung erfährt²⁵. Durch die jeweils an den Anfang von VV. 4-5 gestellten Imperfektformen wird hingegen ein Handeln in der Zeit ausgedrückt (vgl. auch V. 6). Gemeinhin werden die Imperfektformen — ausgehend von der Landgabe-Thematik in V. 5 — präterital wiedergegeben²⁶. Bereits H. Hupfeld hat mit Blick auf die gängige Auslegung darauf hingewiesen, dass die Verwendung des Imperfekts in MT zur Thematik der Landgabe, “Einsetzung in das Land Kanaan”, in Spannung steht²⁷.

²² E. Zenger sieht in dieser Bezeichnung eine Übernahme von Eigenschaften durch JHWH, die ursprünglich der kanaanäischen Gottheit Baal zugeschrieben wurden. Vgl. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 291; JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 54-55.

²³ Vgl. P.C. CRAIGIE, *Psalms 1-50* (WBC 19; Nashville, TN 2004) 349. Einige hebräische Manuskripte korrigieren den Text hin zu der Ps 95,3 entsprechenden Aussage, dass Gott König über alle Götter ist. Dies entspricht zwar der Aussage von Ps 47,3a, widerspricht aber der Intention von V. 3 im Verhältnis zu V. 2 und VV. 4-5.

²⁴ SCHAPER, “Psalm 47”, 269.

²⁵ Vgl. J. HAUSMANN, “‘Gott ist König über die Völker’”, *Vielseitigkeit des Alten Testaments* (Hrsg. J.A. LOADER – H.V. KIEWELER) (Wiener Alttestamentliche Studien 1; Frankfurt am Main 1999) 91-102.

²⁶ Vgl. z.B. HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 291; vgl. auch LXX, die präterital übersetzt.

²⁷ HUPFELD, *Die Psalmen II*, 383. H. Hupfeld löst das Problem, indem er Ps 47,6 analog zu Ps 2,8 liest und die in V. 4 genannten zu unterwerfenden Völker als den in V. 5 genannten Erbteil versteht; vgl. HUPFELD, *Die Psalmen II*, 384.

2. Gottes Handeln (VV. 4-5)

Um die Bedeutung der Zeitform in VV. 4-5 sachgerecht beurteilen zu können, ist es wichtig, in einem ersten Schritt deren Abfolge wahrzunehmen: Die Imperfektformen in VV. 4-5a folgen auf einen Nominalsatz (V. 3), der den Ist-Zustand ausdrückt. Den Imperfektformen in VV. 4-5a schließt sich ein Verbalsatz mit Perfektform an, der eine abgeschlossene Handlung beschreibt (V. 5b).

Aus der Leserichtung von V. 3 kommend, kann die Unterwerfung von Völkern und Nationen in V. 4 durch die Imperfektform als Zukunftshoffnung gelesen werden (vgl. die Formulierung “unter uns” / “unter unsere Füße” in Pss 18,39.48; 45,6; vgl. auch Mi 2,13-14; 4,6-7; Obd 19-21). LXX setzt sowohl in V. 4 als auch in V. 5 einen präteritalen Sinn voraus. Allerdings muss beachtet werden, dass LXX in V. 5 einen abweichenden Text bietet: In LXX wird das Erbteil durch das Personalpronomen nicht wie im MT auf die Wir-Gruppe bezogen, sondern es bezieht sich direkt auf Gott: Das Erbteil ist Gottes Erbteil. Gemäß LXX erwählt Gott seinen Erbteil für die Wir-Gruppe, während gemäß MT Gott den Erbteil der Wir-Gruppe für die Wir-Gruppe erwählt ²⁸.

Dass das Zuteilen nicht ein einmaliger in der Vergangenheit liegender Akt sein muss, zeigt Sach 1,17. Dieser Vers ist Ausdruck der Hoffnung auf die erneute Erwählung Jerusalems nach dem Exil. Ezechiel entwirft für die nach-exilische Zeit eine Neuverteilung des Landes als Erbbesitz (Ez 47,13; vgl. auch Ez 45,1-7; 47,12-48,29) und Ps 69,36-37 thematisiert die Rückkehr aus dem Exil, den Aufbau Zions und der Städte Jerusalems und das Vererben Zions

²⁸ J.S. Burnett argumentiert, dass in Anlehnung an Dtn 32,8-9 und Ps 82 die Lesart, die in LXX und auch in S vorliegt, vorzuziehen sei; vgl. J.S. BURNETT, “The Pride of Jacob”, *David and Zion* (eds. B.F. BATTO – K.L. ROBERTS) (Winona Lake, IN 2004) 319-350. In Dtn 32,8-9 wird das Volk Israel, genannt Jakob, als Erbteil Gottes bezeichnet, nicht das Land oder Jerusalem (vgl. auch Ps 82,8). Die Bezeichnung des Erbteils in Ps 47,5 als Stolz Jakobs verbietet jedoch eine Gleichsetzung von Erbteil und Volk. Die einzige weitere Verwendung der Formel *נחלה* + *בחר* findet sich in Ps 33,12. Hier ist *נחלה* ebenso wie in Dtn 32,9 und Ps 82,8 auf das Volk bezogen. Im Unterschied zu Ps 47,5 wird in Ps 33,12 jedoch das Volk zum (Präposition *ל*) Erbteil auserwählt, während in Ps 47,5 umgekehrt der Erbteil für (Präposition *ל*) die Wir-Gruppe auserwählt wird. Für mich ist kein Grund ersichtlich, warum man den Text von MT emendieren sollte.

und der Städte Judas an die Nachkommen der aus dem Exil Zurückkehrenden. Die Erwählung Jerusalems gemäß Sach 1,17 und die Vererbung Zions gemäß Ps 69,36-37 zeigen zusätzlich, dass der Begriff “Erbteil” nicht notwendig auf das Land zu beziehen ist, sondern potentiell auch Zion / Jerusalem meinen kann²⁹. Zwar wird in Jes 58,14 das Land Israel als Erbteil Jakobs bezeichnet, allerdings ist die Beziehung zwischen נחלה und יעקוב in Ps 46,5 anders verfasst: In Apposition zu dem Begriff “Erbteil” steht die Wendung “Stolz Jakobs”.

3. *Der Stolz Jakobs (V. 5)*

Der Sinngehalt des Ausdrucks גֵּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב ist nicht eindeutig zu bestimmen. גֵּאוֹן bezeichnet sowohl “Herrlichkeit, Hoheit und majestätische Größe” als auch die Kehrseite “Anmaßung, Hochmut und Übermut”. Da גֵּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב das Objekt der göttlichen Erwählung darstellt, kann in Ps 47,5 ohne Zweifel von einer positiven Konnotation des Begriffes ausgegangen werden. J.S. Burnett kommt bei seiner Untersuchung des Begriffes zu folgendem Ergebnis: “The recognition of *gā’ôn*’s persistent association with cities and these related considerations provide an obvious framework of associations within which to understand the expression *gā’ôn ya’aqōb*. That is to say, one might consider whether our expression functions as a city designation in one or any of its occurrences”³⁰. Das Hauptargument, dass er für diese Aussage anführen kann, ist die Verbindung von גֵּאוֹן mit Volksbezeichnungen, wie dies ebenso in Ps 47,5 vorliegt (vgl. Jes 13,19; 23,9; Ez 32,12; Sach 9,5-6; 10,11). Ein kritischer Durchgang durch die von J.S. Burnett angeführten Stellen zeigt jedoch, dass גֵּאוֹן entgegen seiner Annahme keineswegs so deutlich auf eine “Stadt” verweist, wie er es postuliert. Die Grundbedeutung ist und bleibt “Hoheit / Stolz”. Augenfällig wird dies vor allem in Jes 16,6; Jer 48,29 (dem Übermut Moabs), Jer 13,9 (Hochmut Judas und Jerusalems), Hos 5,5; 7,10 (Hochmut Israels). Allgemein ist der Begriff in Verbindung mit einer Land- oder Volksbezeichnung Ausdruck für

²⁹ Gemeinhin wird V. 5 retrospektiv oder prospektiv ausgerichtet auf die Landgabe gelesen; vgl. z.B. K. SEYBOLD, *Die Psalmen* (HAT I/15; Tübingen 1996) 193; HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Die Psalmen I*, 292.

³⁰ BURNETT, “Pride of Jacob”, 324.

eine Hybris. Allerdings kann der Begriff גאון auch positiv auf eine Stadt bzw. Kultstätte hinweisen (vgl. Jes 60,15; Ez 7,24; 24,21). Die genannten Bibelstellen zeigen einerseits, dass ein Bezug auf eine Stadt bzw. ein Heiligtum möglich ist; auf der anderen Seite wird deutlich, dass der Aspekt der Hoheit/Herrlichkeit und des Stolzes im Vordergrund steht.

Inwiefern spiegelt sich dieser Befund in jenen Texten wider, in denen ebenso wie in Ps 47,5 von גאון יעקב die Rede ist (vgl. Amos 6,8; 8,7; Nah 2,3)?

- Amos 6,8 bildet den Auftakt zu einem Gotteswort gegen Samaria, in dem JHWH der Hauptstadt des Nordreiches die Auslieferung per Schwur ankündigt (vgl. V. 8b). V. 8a ist das Urteil über die Schuld: Der Hochmut Jakobs ist von Gott verabscheut³¹. Als Sinnbild für diesen Hochmut werden die mehrstöckigen Wohngebäude genannt (vgl. Am 3,9-11). Der Schwur Gottes bei גאון יעקב in Am 8,7 ist eine schriftgelehrte Aufnahme von Am 6,8, die mit der doppelten Bedeutung von גאון spielt. Die Hoheit Jakobs ist außerhalb des Volkes zu verorten und basiert im Endeffekt auf der Königsmacht Gottes; dies verkehrt das Volk jedoch, indem es aus sich heraus Übermut entwickelt³².
- Nah 2,3 ist in mehrfacher Hinsicht schwierig zu interpretieren. 1.) Das Wort שׁב findet sich nur an dieser Stelle im Buch Nahum und lässt sich auf mehrfache Weise auslegen. Als konträre Beispiele können die Übersetzungen von H.-J. Fabry und D.L. Christensen dienen: H.-J. Fabry übersetzt “zurückgewiesen hatte”³³ (vgl. Lxx) während D.L. Christensen mit “restoring”³⁴ übersetzt. 2.) Nur in Nah 2,3 werden innerhalb des Buches die Begriffe Jakob und Israel genannt. Daher lässt sich Jakob sowohl auf Juda als auch auf das Nordreich beziehen, während die Nennung Israels offen auf

³¹ Textkritisch ist מוֹתֵב als מוֹתֵב zu lesen; vgl. H.W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton* (BK XIV; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985) 327.

³² Vgl. J. JEREMIAS, *Der Prophet Amos* (ATD 24/2; Göttingen 1995) 118.

³³ H.-J. FABRY, *Nahum* (HThKAT; Freiburg 2006) 158.

³⁴ D.L. CHRISTENSEN, *Nahum* (AB 24; New Haven, CT 2009) 265.

das Nordreich aber auch auf Gesamtisrael ist. 3.) Die Partikel כ kann emphatisch oder als Vergleichspartikel gelesen werden. Trotz der komplexen sprachlichen Ausgangslage scheint es mir plausibler, dass in Nah 2,3 von der Wiederherstellung der Hoheit Judas ³⁵ gesprochen wird, die der Hoheit des vereinigten Königreiches Israel vergleichbar sein wird ³⁶. Was der Begriff נאון konkret bezeichnet, ist nicht zu entschlüsseln.

In Ps 47,5 qualifiziert נאון יעקוב den Erbteil der Wir-Gruppe als Stolz Jakobs, ohne explizit zu definieren, was damit gemeint ist und ob sich dahinter das Land oder eine/die Stadt verbirgt. Diese Offenheit wird durch die Rahmung von Psalm 47 durch die Gottesstadt-Psalmen 46 und 48 auf Jerusalem hin verdeutlicht, der schönen Anhöhe (Ps 48,3), auf der Gott als Höchster herrscht. Durch die Argumentation von J.S. Burnett wird deutlich, dass in Ps 47,5 der Bezug auf Jerusalem sich für ihn nicht nur aus der Bezeichnung "Stolz Jakobs" konstituiert, sondern sich für ihn zuerst aus seiner einführenden intertextuellen Lektüre von Ps 47,5b mit Ps 78,68 ergibt (vgl. auch an beiden Stellen die Verwendung von בחר). In Ps 78,68 wird die Aussage אשר אהב, die in Ps 47,5 als Relativsatz den Ausdruck נאון יעקוב bestimmt, als Feststellung der Liebe Gottes auf den Berg Zion bezogen: Gott liebt den Berg Zion ³⁷. Die Liebe Gottes zu Zion findet sich auch im näheren Kontext von Psalm 47: Auch im zweiten Korachpsalter ist ausdrücklich von der Liebe Gottes zu Zion die Rede (Ps 87,2; vgl. auch Mal 2,11) ³⁸.

³⁵ Vgl. die Bezeichnung Jakob für Juda z.B. in Jes 43,1; 44,1; 46,3; Jer 5,20; Obd 18.

³⁶ Dass mit Jakob Juda gemeint ist, legt sich aus V. 1 nahe. Da zwischen "Stolz Jakobs" und "Stolz Israels" meiner Ansicht nach der Vergleichspartikel steht, sind die Begriffe nicht synonym zu lesen, wie dies sonst häufig der Fall ist, vor allem im Psalter.

³⁷ Es ist zu fragen, ob sich der אשר-Satz auf das *nomen rectum* bezieht (so bereits HUPFELD, *Die Psalmen*, 261) oder auf die gesamte Constructus-Verbindung. Zwar sagt Mal 1,2 (vgl. Jes 41,8) die besondere Liebe Gottes zu Jakob aus, allerdings ist es grammatikalisch unwahrscheinlich, dass der אשר-Satz sich nur auf einen Teil der Constructus-Verbindung bezieht.

³⁸ Vgl. A. CAQUOT, "Le psaume 47 et la royauté de Yahwé", *RHPR* 39 (1959) 311-337, 319; andeutungsweise auch J. SCHREINER, *Sion-Jerusalem, Jahwes Königssitz* (StANT 7; München 1963) 198.

Zusammenfassend kann daher in Bezug auf Ps 47,5 gesagt werden, dass der zukünftige Erbteil der Wir-Gruppe (vgl. Ez 47,13; Sach 1,17; Ps 69,36f.) der Stolz Jakobs ist, womit Jerusalem / Zion gemeint sein kann (vgl. Jes 60,15; Ez 24,21; Mal 2,11; Ps 78,68; 87,2).

4. *Der Grund für das Lob (V. 6)*

Die in V. 6 ausgedrückte Handlung besteht aus drei Aspekten und schließt die explizierende Begründung für das Lob in VV. 4-6 ab: Verbal wird die Handlung durch das Verb עלה angezeigt; dieses wird begleitet von “Jubellärm” und dem “Klang des Schofars” als adverbiale Bestimmungen des Verbes. Entsprechend der Funktion von V. 6 als Scharniervers hat das Verb עלה meiner Ansicht nach eine zweifache Bedeutung, die der Leser aus V. 6 schließen kann.

a.) In einer ersten Bedeutung zeigt dieses Verb eine Bewegung an. H. Gunkel hat darauf hingewiesen, dass das Verb u.a. verwendet wird, um das “in die Königsburg bzw. zum König oder zur Autoritätsperson hinaufgehen” auszudrücken (Gen 46,31; Num 16,12.24; Ri 4,5; 1 Sam 23,19; 1 Kön 1,35; Ps 68,19) ³⁹. Die Begleitung dieses Hinaufzugs durch Jubellärm und den Klang des Schofars kann, wenn man es parallel zu 1 Kön 1,39-40.45 liest, als Freudenzug zur Inthronisation gelesen werden. Nach der Salbung am Gihon wird Salomo nach dem Klang des Schofars mit Freudenlärm hinauf zu seinem Thron geleitet. Gemäß dieser ersten Bedeutung des Verbes expliziert V. 6 die verlangte Freude in V. 2 als Jubel über das aktualisierte Königtum Gottes (V. 3b; vgl. V. 9).

b.) Eine zweite Lesemöglichkeit ergibt sich, wenn man עלה im Sinne der Kriegsvorbereitung übersetzt (vgl. 1 Kön 20,22; Jes 21,2; Mi 2,13) ⁴⁰; dementsprechend wäre Gott zum Krieg hinaufgezogen. Sowohl תרועה als auch שופר sind Kriegstermini. Der Schofar diente unter anderem dazu, den Heerbann zum Kampf zu sammeln und den Beginn des Krieges anzuzeigen (vgl. Ri 3,27; 6,34; 7,8.16.20; vgl. auch 2 Sam 20,11 und Jer 51,27). Ebenso konnte der Jubellärm bzw. das Kriegsgeschrei den Beginn eines Krieges markieren (vgl. Ri 15,14; 1 Sam 17,20; Jer 42,13; Jer 4,19; Ez 21,27; vgl. auch Ps 108,10).

³⁹ H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (GHAT; Göttingen 1926) 202.

⁴⁰ Vgl. I.L. SEELIGMANN, “Psalm 47”, *Textus* 23 (2007) 219-220.

Beide Lesemöglichkeiten von V. 6 schließen einander nicht aus. Der zum Kampf bereite Gott ist der Gott, der gemäß V. 9 König ist und vom Thron seiner Heiligkeit herrscht. Sowohl das Hinaufsteigen zum Thron als Aktualisierung der Königsherrschaft als auch das Hinaufziehen zum Kampf bilden die Grundlage für die Aussagen in VV. 4-5. Den Aussagen in VV. 4-5 geht V. 6 gemäß der Verbform als geschaffene Voraussetzung zeitlich voraus.

5. Zusammenfassung zu und Auswertung von VV. 2-5.6

Vor allem Sach 1,17 und Ps 69,36-37 zeigen Möglichkeiten auf, Ps 46,5 als Zukunftshoffnung bezogen auf Jerusalem/Zion zu lesen. Die sich selbst ansprechende Wir-Gruppe in VV. 4-5 geht aufgrund des Königtums Gottes (V. 3) und der nach VV. 4-5 postulierten Macht JHWHs, entweder als Kriegsbereitschaft oder als Königsmachtaktualisierung, von einer Restitution des Volkes Jakobs und zumindest Jerusalems aus. Dass es sich nicht allein um eine Hoffnung, sondern um eine Gewissheit handelt, zeigt der Relativsatz in V. 5b an. Die Liebe Gottes zu Zion/Jerusalem als Grundaxiom (Perfektform) sichert die Gewissheit des göttlichen Eingreifens. Für die Wir-Gruppe bilden VV. 4-5.6 die Konsequenz des Königtums Gottes.

Dementsprechend unterteilt C. Körting die beiden Strophen des Psalms (VV. 2-5 und VV. 7-10) nach ihrer Aussageintention: "Im ersten Teil ist die Bedeutung des Königtums Gottes für Israel aufgezeigt, im zweiten Teil sind es die Konsequenzen für die Völker"⁴¹. In Bezug auf den von B. Duhm und E. Zenger gesehenen Widerspruch zwischen der Lobaufforderung an alle Völker in VV. 2-3 und der Unterwerfung von Völkern (V. 4) schreibt sie weiter: "Aus dieser Perspektive wird deutlich, dass V. 4 nicht sogleich als eine Aussage der Feindschaft zwischen Israel und den Völkern zu verstehen ist. Die Macht des Gottes Israels hebt die Macht der Völker auf und unterwirft diese dem kleinen Israel"⁴².

In einem ersten Schritt ist nun der von E. Zenger literarkritisch ausgewertete Befund, dass der Begriff עַמִּים in V. 2a und V. 4a

⁴¹ C. KÖRTING, "Israel und die Völker im Lobpreis", *Beyond Biblical Theologies* (Hrsg. H. ASSEL – S. BEYERLE – C. BÖTTRICH) (WUNT I/295; Tübingen 2012) 311.

⁴² KÖRTING, "Israel und die Völker", 311.

unterschiedlich verwendet wird, neu zu beurteilen. Hierbei handelt es sich nicht um einen literarkritischen Bruch, sondern um eine bewusste Unterscheidung. Während die gesamte Völkerwelt (determinierte Verwendung) zum Jubel und damit zur Anerkenntnis der Macht Gottes aufgefordert wird (V. 2a), resultiert die Unterwerfung eines Teils der Völkerwelt (nicht-determinierte Verwendung) nach V. 4a aus Gottes Königsherrschaft über die Welt und aus seiner besonderen Beziehung zur Wir-Gruppe sowie seiner Liebe zum Zion. Die Begründung für den geforderten Jubel bzw. die Anerkenntnis der göttlichen Macht wird in V. 3 gegeben. VV. 4-5 sind das antizipierte Resultat der in V. 3 dargelegten Machtverhältnisse. Mit der Anerkenntnis der Macht wird auch die Anerkenntnis gefordert, dass die Wir-Gruppe als selbstständige politische Entität wiederhergestellt wird. V. 2 ist nicht als Jubel über die erhoffte Wiederherstellung der Wir-Gruppe als politische Größe in einem eigenen Gebiet zu lesen, sondern als Anerkenntnis, dass die Wir-Gruppe wieder als politische Größe in einem eigenen Gebiet errichtet wird – die Aufforderung zur Freude ist die geforderte eigene Unterwerfung der Völker unter die Herrschaft Gottes. Dieser Gedanke steht im Einklang mit der Aussage von V. 10; dort wird der Begriff “König/Könige” für die Herrscher der Völker bewusst vermieden, und ihre Macht wird depotenziert, wenn sie als Volk des Gottes Abrahams bezeichnet werden. Radikal gelesen, drückt VV. 4-5 den Willen Gottes aus, dem sich die Völker als Volk dieses Gottes unterwerfen sollen.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich festhalten, dass V. 2 die gesamte Völkerwelt aufruft, öffentlich Freude zu zeigen in der Anerkenntnis der Macht Gottes, der in V. 3 als höchster Gott, wirkmächtig und als höchster weltlich-politischer Herrscher gepriesen wird. Aus der die Himmel und die Welt umfassenden Herrschaft Gottes resultiert in VV. 4-5 die Gewissheit, dass die Wir-Gruppe als Nation in Zion/Jerusalem wiederhergestellt wird. V. 6 liest sich zum Einen als Aussage über die Kampfbereitschaft Gottes gegenüber den Völkern, die der Aufforderung in V. 2 nicht folgen bzw. als Kriegsbeginn gegen die Völker, die der Restitution der Wir-Gruppe als Nation in Zion/Jerusalem entgegenstehen. Zum Zweiten nimmt V. 6 den Gottestitel “Höchster” und die Königsthematik von V. 3 wieder auf, die dort die Macht symbolisierte und nun die Thronbesteigung Gottes (vgl. V. 9) anzeigt.

III. VV. 7-10: Wie die Völker jubeln sollen

VV. 7-8 weisen eine parallele Struktur zu VV. 2-3 auf: Imperative fordern zum Lob auf, was durch einen כִּי-Satz begründet wird. Die fünffache Aufforderung zu singen führt direkt auf den Begriff מְשִׁיחַ in V. 8b zu. Dieser intensive Einsatz führt unweigerlich zu der Frage, wer im zweiten Teil von Psalm 47 was singen soll. Der Vokativ in V. 2a, “alle Völker” und das Faktum, dass dies die einzige Adressatenanrede in Psalm 47 ist, spricht für die Annahme, dass die Aufforderung an die Völker gerichtet ist⁴³. W.A.M. Beuken vertritt hingegen die Ansicht, dass mit V. 7 die Anrede an Israel beginnt⁴⁴. Er verweist darauf, dass זָמַר primär für den kultischen Gesang Israels verwendet wird und die Bezeichnung “unser König” niemals in einer die Völker miteinschließenden Funktion verwendet wird; zusätzlich betont er, dass VV. 9-10 nicht an die Völkerwelt gerichtet sind, sondern über die Völkerwelt handeln. Gegen diese Argumentation ist auf Psalm 66 hinzuweisen, der analog zu Ps 47,2 in V. 1 die ganze Erde auffordert, Gott zuzujubeln, und analog zu Ps 47,7-8 auffordert, zu singen. V. 8a verdeutlicht darüber hinaus, dass die Verwendung des enklitischen Personalpronomens in der 1. Pers. Plural keine inklusive Bedeutung voraussetzt. Während gemäß VV. 2-3 durch Jubel die Anerkenntnis Gottes als mächtiger König über die Welt von den Völkern gefordert wird, bekennt sich die Wir-Gruppe in Ps 47,8a zu Gott als ihrem König und fordert die Völker zum Lobgesang an Gott auf.

Dass nach der Begründung zu den Imperativen die Aufforderung zum Singen wiederholt wird und das Objekt zu den Imperativen genannt wird, erklärt sich bei einer näheren Betrachtung des Wortes מְשִׁיחַ. Die Bedeutung des Wortes ist umstritten, allerdings findet es sich über Ps 47,8 hinaus ausschließlich in Psalmenüberschriften⁴⁵.

⁴³ Da אֱלֹהִים in V. 7 ohne vorgefügtes ל geschrieben steht, ließe sich theoretisch Gott als im Vokativ Angesprochener lesen. Allerdings zeigen z.B. die Parallelen in Ps 68,5.33, dass Gott hier das Objekt des Lobes ist.

⁴⁴ Vgl. BEUKEN, “Psalm XLVII”, 40.

⁴⁵ Vgl. K. KOENEN, “שָׁכַל šākal”, *THWAT* VII, 793-794; bisher konnte in der Forschung kein eindeutiges Kriterium ausgemacht werden, das einen Psalm zu einem *Maskil* macht; vgl. die Bezeichnung von Psalm 53 als *Maskil*, während sich über Psalm 14 keine *Maskil*-Bezeichnung findet.

Zieht man zusätzlich zu diesem Befund noch den in VV. 7-8 fünffach erfolgenden Aufruf zum Lobgesang an Gott hinzu, lassen sich VV. 9-10 als von den Völkern zu singender Psalm lesen. Da die Wir-Gruppe in V. 8 Gott bereits als ihren König bezeichnet, muss die Königsakklamation in V. 9a im Mund der Völkerwelt verortet werden. Der Ausruf מלך + Eigenname zeigt in 2 Sam 15,10 und 2 Kön 9,13 die verkündende und anerkannte Königsherrschaft eines neuen Königs an (vgl. auch Jes 24,23). Mit V. 9a wird die Königswerdung in ihrem Resultat affirmiert, und somit löst V. 9 den in V. 2 geforderten Jubel der Völker ein, der durch die universale Königsherrschaft Gottes begründet wird (V. 3b; vgl. V. 8a). Als Objekt der Königsherrschaft werden in V. 9 nicht die Völker der Welt sondern im Anschluss an den politisch-religiösen Titel “großer König” aus V. 3b die Nationen als politische Größen genannt⁴⁶. Die Königsherrschaft Gottes aus V. 9a wird in V. 9b als Sitzen Gottes auf dem Thron seiner Heiligkeit in Szene gesetzt. Anders als in V. 9a findet sich hier *x-qāṭal*: Damit wird nicht ausgedrückt, dass Gott sich auf den Thron gesetzt hat (vgl. 1 Kön 1,46), sondern dass er ein- für allemal auf dem Thron sitzt, und die Macht des Throns ausübt (vgl. 1 Kön 2,12). Der Thron ist das Symbol der Königswürde und -macht.

Während V. 9 somit die Anerkenntnis der Macht Gottes als König durch die Völker anzeigt, präsentiert V. 10 die Unterordnung der Völker bzw. der Könige der Völker gegenüber Gott. In V. 10 wird die Bezeichnung “König” für die Herrscher der Völker bewusst vermieden. Folgt man der Annahme, dass VV. 9-10 die Worte der Völker zitieren, bezeichnen sie sich sogar selbst als Fürsten/Edle der Völker⁴⁷ und Schilde der Erde⁴⁸. Dass die Versammlung der fremden Machthaber durch ein Perfekt ausgedrückt wird und somit als ein vollzogenes Ereignis dargestellt wird, ergibt

⁴⁶ Im Gegensatz zum Vokativ in V. 2a, indem allumfassend “alle” Völker angesprochen werden (vgl. V 3b), verwundert in V. 9a die Aussage, dass Gott “nur” über Nationen als König herrscht und nicht über “alle” Nationen. Vielleicht erklärt sich dies aus der Zukunftsperspektive von VV. 4-5, gemäß derer noch Völker und Völkerschaften unterworfen werden müssen.

⁴⁷ Vgl. Pss 83,12; 107,40; 118,9 u.ö. Zusätzlich schwingt in נריב die Bedeutung “willig/bereitwillig” mit (vgl. z.B. Spr 19,6; 1 Chr 28,21), die die Gruppe von Ps 47,10 passend als diejenigen ausweist, die bereitwillig die Königsherrschaft Gottes in den eigenen Worten anerkennen.

⁴⁸ Vgl. als Königsbezeichnung in Pss 84,9; 89,19.

nur einen Sinn, wenn im Vollzug der Worte von VV. 9-10 als Worte der Völker die Versammlung konstituiert ist. Syntaktisch handelt es sich um "a predicative adjunct which expresses the result of the action"⁴⁹. Die Versammlung und die Anerkennung macht die Edlen/Fürsten der Völker zum Volk des Gottes Abrahams⁵⁰. Wichtig an der Bezeichnung als Volk des Gottes Abrahams ist der klare Unterschied zu der Nennung Jakobs in V. 5. Die Trennung zwischen Israel und den Völkern wird durch V. 10 nicht aufgehoben. Vielmehr werden verschiedene Kreise gezeichnet: "Jakob steht für das erwählte Israel, Abraham für die Hinwendung Gottes zu den Völkern"⁵¹. Die Bezeichnung "Volk des Gottes Abrahams" zeigt die Zugehörigkeit der Könige der Welt zu Gott an, deren Resultat der Lobpreis und die nochmalige verbalisierte Anerkennung der Macht Gottes in den letzten beiden Worten des Psalms darstellt. Gott, der Höchste hat sich zu seiner Königsherrschaft erhoben und wird als hoch erhaben von den Völkern gepriesen.

IV. Gott erhebt sich zur Anerkennung durch die Völker nach Zion

JHWH, der gemäß V. 3a der höchste Gott ist, hat sich erhoben (V. 6), um für die Wir-Gruppe zu streiten, und sie wieder zu einer territorial verfassten Nation zu machen. Psalm 47 erwartet gemäß VV. 4-5 die Rückführung der Exilierten nach Jerusalem – Psalm 47 ist somit Ausdruck der exilischen Hoffnung auf die Wiederherstellung der vor-exilischen Verhältnisse. Den Glauben an die Restitution knüpft der Psalm gemäß V. 3 an das Bekenntnis, dass

⁴⁹ BEUKEN, "Psalm XLVII", 45-46.

⁵⁰ LXX und S setzen eine Lesart voraus, die den Konsonantenbestand מִי als die Präposition "mit" gelesen/gedeutet hat, wodurch eine scheinbar orthodoxere Lesart der Trennung von Völkern und Volk Jakobs/Abrahams angezeigt wird, vgl. auch SEYBOLD, *Die Psalmen*, 192, 194; vgl. für eine andere Deutung: K. BODNER, "The 'Embarrassing Syntax' of Ps. 47:10", *JTS* 54 (2003) 570-575.

⁵¹ KÖRTING, "Israel und die Völker", 312. Es ist der Gott Abrahams, der dem Erzvater verheißt, aus ihm großen Nationen und Könige hervorgehen zu lassen (Gen 17,6). Der Gott Abrahams ist der Gott, der nach Jos 24,3-4 den Patriarchen zum Proselyten gemacht hat; vgl. E. ZENGER, "Der Gott Abrahams und die Völker", *Die Väter Israels* (Hrsg. M. GÖRG – A. R. MÜLLER) (Stuttgart 1989) 428-431.

Gott der höchste Gott und weltpolitisch der größte König ist. Allein seine Handlungsmacht vermag die Weltverhältnisse zu verändern. Das Bekenntnis zu Gott als himmlischen und weltlichen Allherrscher dient in Psalm 47 der Aufforderung an die Völker, durch ihren Jubel (V. 2) und durch die Rezitation des Psalms in Psalm 47 (VV. 9-10) Gott als König zu bestätigen (V. 9a), seine Macht anzuerkennen (V. 9) und sich als Volk dieses allmächtigen Königs zu unterwerfen (V. 10).

Die in V. 6 im Perfekt ausgedrückte Erhebung Gottes wird durch die Worte der Völker bzw. der Könige der Völker als Übernahme der Macht (vgl. Ps 97,9) bestätigt. Die fehlende Ortsangabe in V. 6 erfüllt in diesem Zusammenhang eine mehrfache Funktion. a.) *עלה* als Ausdruck für die Kriegsvorbereitung (vgl. 1 Kön 20,22; Jes 21,2; Mi 2,13) zeigt die Bereitschaft Gottes, die in VV. 4-5 anvisierte Zukunft durch Gewalt zu realisieren. b.) *עלה* als Ausdruck der Bewegung hin zur Königsburg bzw. zur Autoritätsperson (Gen 46,31; Num 16,12.24; Ri 4,5; 1 Sam 23,19; 1 Kön 1,35; Ps 68,19) zeigt den Weg Gottes zu seiner eigenen Königsherrschaft und zu seinem Sitzen auf dem Thron an (V. 9)⁵². V. 6 und V. 9 entsprechen einander als perfektische Verbalsätze, in denen das Verb *עלה* aus V. 6a in V. 9 durch die Präposition *על* zweifach aufgenommen wird: Gott hat sich zum König über Nationen erhoben und sitzt nun auf dem Thron. Das Erheben Gottes aus V. 6 findet somit in V. 9 sein eigentliches Ziel in der Machtaussage und dem symbolischen Thronen. Gott hat sich erhoben, um (wieder) auf seinem Thron Platz zu nehmen. c.) Die fehlende Ortsangabe wird intra-textuell und inter-textuell durch V. 5 und V. 9 gefüllt. Die Spezifizierung des Erbteils der Wir-Gruppe in V. 5 als “Stolz Jakobs, den Gott liebt bzw. lieb gewonnen hat”⁵³ kann durch den Leser als Zion/Jerusalem identifiziert werden (vgl. Jes 60,15; Ez 24,21; Mal 2,11; Pss 78,68; 87,2); gleichzeitig behält V. 5 jedoch seine Offenheit in der Ortsangabe, und kann sich sowohl auf das Land als auch nur auf Zion beziehen. Die Kompositoren der Korachpsalmen hingegen verstärken meiner Ansicht nach den Zionsbezug in Psalm 47 deutlich – denn dank ihrer Kompositionsarbeit ist Psalm 47 nunmehr umrahmt von zwei Psalmen, die jeweils eine Theologie der Gottesstadt entwerfen, die

⁵² Vgl. JEREMIAS, *Königtum Gottes*, 60.

⁵³ Zusätzlich schwingt in *עלה* die Bedeutung des Pilgers/Wallfahrtens mit (vgl. F. FUHS, “*עלה* ‘ālāh’”, *TWAT* VI, 97). In Ps 47,6 wird keine Wallfahrt angezeigt, aber das Wort *עלה* könnte das Hinaufziehen nach Zion anzeigen.

Jerusalem / Zion thematisiert ⁵⁴. Die Kompositoren der Korachpsalmen haben durch die Aufeinanderfolge von Psalmen 46.47.48 eine Stichwortverknüpfung dieser drei Psalmen durch das Wort “heilig” (קדוש) geschaffen ⁵⁵: In Ps 46,5 bildet der Tempel die Mitte der Stadt als “heiligste der Wohnstätte des Höchsten” ⁵⁶. In Ps 48,3 ist Zion der Berg der Heiligkeit Gottes. Zwischen diesen beiden Benennungen von Zion/Jerusalem als Ort der Heiligkeit steht in Ps 47,9 die Nennung des Thrones Gottes als Thron seiner Heiligkeit, auf dem Gott thront. Sein Hinaufsteigen nach V. 6 gipfelt im Sitzen auf seinem Thron, der gemäß der kontextuellen Interpretation (vgl. Pss 46,5; 48,3) auf dem Zion, in Jerusalem zu verorten ist.

Psalm 47 ist somit in dreifacher Weise Ausdruck der Hoffnung auf die Rückkehr aus dem Exil, die an den Glauben an die himmlische und weltliche Macht Gottes geknüpft ist und verknüpft ist mit der Sehnsucht nach Jerusalem / Zion als Ort des Stolzes Jakobs und als Ort des Thrones der Heiligkeit Gottes (vgl. Ps 137,4-5) ⁵⁷.

Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität Bonn Till Magnus STEINER
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät,
Alttestamentliches Seminar
Regina-Pacis-Weg 1a
D – 53113 Bonn

SUMMARY

Ps 47,6 states that God has “gone up” but does not clarify where He is ascending to. In recent research this verse is therefore interpreted in many different ways. To be sure, the ambiguity of this verse definitely affects the interpretation of the Psalm as a whole. In this article we argue that V. 6 — when read in the context of Psalm 47 and of Psalms 46-48 — may express the strong belief that God returns back to Jerusalem / Zion after the exile.

⁵⁴ Vgl. T.M. STEINER, “Perceived and Narrated Space in Psalm 48”, *OTE* 25 (2012) 685-704; T.M. STEINER, “God is in the Midst of the City”, *Holy Places in Biblical and Extrabiblical Traditions* (eds. J. FLEBBE – M. WOLTER) (BBB; Göttingen 2014) (im Druck).

⁵⁵ Vgl. J.-M. SCHÄDER, “Understanding (the Lack of) Space in Psalm 47:6 in Light of its Neighbouring Psalms”, *OTE* 23 (2010) 139-160.

⁵⁶ Vgl. zu diesem Verständnis STEINER, “Midst of the City” (im Druck).

⁵⁷ Am Ende dieses Artikels möchte ich besonders Herrn Prof. Dr. J.S. Burnett für den interessanten und weiterführenden wissenschaftlichen Gedankenaustausch danken.

Psalm 65 as Non-Appropriation Theology

In the Bible, the receiver of God's promises is not allowed to claim these promises. I call this biblical perspective non-appropriation theology. This non-appropriation theology can very often be observed in narrative texts. I have already pointed out that Gen 22,1-19 reflects this non-appropriation theology within the Abraham-cycle: Abraham does not himself outrightly possess the realization of God's promises, formulated in 12,2, but rather has to forfeit the realisation of these promises by giving up his son Isaac ¹.

In this article, I will uncover the non-appropriation theology which can be found in the poetic text of Psalm 65. The first-person-characters of Psalm 65 and, in their wake, the text-internal reader are usually supposed to enjoy the Lord's blessings, such as being chosen and inhabiting the Promised Land. However, a communication analysis shows this interpretation to be rather problematic, for in Psalm 65 there is no identification at all between the first-person-characters and the recipients of the Lord's blessings! The text-internal reader is also purposely blocked from being chosen and from receiving the Promised Land. A communication-oriented analysis makes it clear that the position of both the "I"-character and the text-internal reader can be described as being in a position of non-appropriation.

This exegetical result matches ancient re-readings of the psalm. I will deal with two of them: the new heading of Psalm 65 in the Vulgate, and the use of Psalm 65 in the funeral liturgy according to the Roman rite. The reluctance to personally appropriate the promises made by the Lord in the psalm is theologically relevant.

¹ A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, "The Reader in Genesis 22:1-19: Textsyntax – Textsemantics – Textpragmatics", *EstBib* 53 (1995) 289-304.

I. The plot of Psalm 65

Psalm 65 offers a complex communicative whole, which consists of two main units: verses 2-9 and 10-14². I will go through the text in order to outline the plot in which the communicative aspects of this psalm appear. In verses 2-3, the psalm begins with addressing God. This God is located in Zion. The text-internal author does not speak about himself — the word “I” is not used. He makes it clear that this address has a universal import: “all flesh comes to you”. The word בָּשָׂר *bāšār* means “all mankind”, from the perspective of mankind’s fragility and mortality³. Mankind does not create his own world; he is limited. Within his limitedness, the psalmist enters into the relationship with the “Hearer of prayers”.

Verse 4 is very remarkable: it is the only “I”-verse. After having addressed God and having located everybody in relation to God, the psalmist takes up his own position: an “I”-form is used.

The psalmist does so by creating two tensions. The first tension has to do with the distinction between past and present. The psalmist brackets himself and the transgressions together; however he does this using a past perspective (*qāṭal*-form), looking back in time: “Words of misdeeds were stronger (גָּבַר) than me” (v. 4a). The transgressions, therefore, appear to belong to the past. The now-moment (*yiqtol*-form) is different: “You forgive them (תְּכַפֵּר) ” (v. 4b). In the now-moment of the prayer, forgiveness rather than sinfulness is at issue⁴.

The second tension is the distinction between the “I” and the “we”. The singular “I” is responsible for the transgressions. One cannot blame someone else for one’s own sins. The “I” must be connected to the transgressions. The forgiveness, however, is formulated in the first person plural: “our transgressions, you forgive them” (v. 4b). Whereas the misdeeds are individual, the forgiveness is collective. In the forgiveness, the community arises, a “we”.

² Pace F.-L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Psalmen 51-100* (HTKAT; Freiburg 2000), who read three units on page 212-213, but suggest two units on page 218.

³ See G. GERLEMAN, “בָּשָׂר *bāšār* Fleisch”, *ThHAT* 1 (1978) 379.

⁴ The verbal tenses indicate the textual perspective towards the event described; see especially W. SCHNEIDER, *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch* (München⁹2001) §§ 48.3.1-48.3.2; E. TALSTRA, “Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible I: Elements of a Theory”, *BiOr* 35 (1978) 170-172. These ideas are based on H. WEINRICH, *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (Stuttgart²1971).

In verse 5, this movement is continued. After having introduced God, to whom the prayer is directed, and his location in Zion, as well as the praying men and, subsequently, the psalmist himself by using the grammatical “I”-form, God’s location becomes accessible to everyone. In this way, verse 5 forms an inclusion with verses 2-3, framing verse 4. Just as the text develops from the universal indication of “all flesh” in verses 2-3 into the concrete “we” of the community in verse 4, the general “he” in verse 5a-b develops into the concrete “we” of the community in verse 5c-d.

Whereas in verses 2-3 the movement is made, twice, from a general everyone — “all flesh” (v. 3b) and “he whom you choose” (v. 5a) — to the communal “we”, in verses 6-9 the reverse movement is made.

In verses 6-7 this movement is expressed in the route from “our deliverance” (v. 6b) to “all ends of the earth” (v. 6c) and to “the sea of the remote ones” (v. 6d). The extremities of the mainland, surrounded by seas, are the most remote parts of the earth. Even there the liberating power of this God in Zion is noticeable. Even there one can rely on being answered, on forgiveness and being chosen and on the development of the community of the faithful.

Verses 8-9 concretize this movement. Firstly, the mountains have been fixed. The mountains are the pillars of the earth: the earth will not collapse. God guarantees the foundation and the continuity of the world men live on. Furthermore, God calms the bristling nations, just as a wild sea is calmed down. This implies that not only the mainland resting on the pillars of the earth is safe, but also the land of Israel. Just as firmly as the earth is established, just as safe is the Land (Israel) from all the bristling nations ⁵.

Just as the psalmist mentions all people twice in verses 3b and 5a, so he mentions the extremities twice in verses 6c-d and 9. At “the extremities of the morning” and “the extremities of the evening” (v. 9), i.e. the eastern edge and the western edge of the earth, God’s power and might are present as well. By using this repetition, the psalmist emphasises that even the extremities know God and are filled with awe, because of which they are full of joy.

⁵ Cf. O. KEEL, *Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament*. Am Beispiel der Psalmen (Zürich 1972) 154, who points out the difference between the threat of chaos for the entire world and the threat of the nations for Zion.

In the first main unit, verses 2-9, a movement of zooming in (verses 2-5) is made, followed by a movement of zooming out (verses 6-9). In the second main unit, verses 10-14, the consequences of the first main unit for the fertility of אֶרֶץ are described.

Verse 10 re-uses images which occur in verses 8-9. Firstly, the water image is re-used. The ‘water’ words “sea” appear in verses 6d and 8a and “wave” in verse 8b, just as the “water” words “to irrigate”, “canal”, and “water” do in verse 10. Just as the seas are calmed down, so is the water made suitable for irrigating the land.

Furthermore, just as the world is fixed, so does the wheat appear to be fixed. This expression in Psalm 65 is unique in the Bible. The activity of fixing is normally used for the pillars of the earth. The psalmist, however, wishes to indicate that the wheat will grow into an abundant harvest in the land, just as the mainland is firmly fixed on the pillars of the earth. Even more so, because the earth is fixed by God himself, the wheat is guaranteed by God for the land. To emphasize this, the psalmist uses the expression תְּכַיֵּן “you fix” twice in verse 10. The barley-harvest is the first harvest of the season, the wheat-harvest the last. Exactly by mentioning the last harvest, the psalmist accentuates the importance of God’s lasting activity of fixing⁶.

Verse 11 combines these two images. God continues to be both the one addressed as well as the acting character. The actions end with the climactic activity of blessing.

The concluding verses 12-14 continue the fertility theme. Agriculture (“pasture” in verse 14) and cattle farming (“grazing land” in verse 13 and “cattle” in verse 14) are both mentioned. The activity of God’s blessing is continued as well implying a “crowned year”, the abundance of which is expressed by using the word “to drip” in verses 12 and 13 twice, just like the verb “to fix”.

The finale is all festivity: “to exult” and “to sing” (v. 14c). In this way, the second main unit ends just like the first main unit, which concludes with joy in verse 9b. Moreover, the psalmist com-

⁶ Very often, the repetition of the word תְּכַיֵּן in Psalm 65 is not noticed; see, e.g. E.K. HOLT, “‘... *ad fontes aquarum*’: God as Water in the Psalms?”, *Metaphors in the Psalms* (eds. P. VAN HECKE – A. LABAHN) (BETL 231; Leuven 2010) 78. If the repetition of the word is noticed, two meanings of this verb are normally supposed: “to fix” for verse 7 and “to prepare” for verse 10; *pace*, among others, F. SEDLMEIER, *Jerusalem – Jahwes Bau*. Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie von Psalm 147 (FzB 79; Würzburg 1996) 267.

bines the finale with the beginning of the poem ⁷. The hymn has developed from silence to singing, a transition effectuated by God through his liberating activities, which involve both universal features as well as the actual Land.

II. Non-appropriation by the “I”-character in Psalm 65

The plot of Psalm 65 has only one single “I”-verse. Only in verse 4, does the “I” become visible in the tension between past and present and in the transition from the individual to the collective, to a “we”. The “I”, therefore, cannot be directly reached in the poem of Psalm 65.

The position of the “I” is continued in verse 5 regarding being chosen by God and concerning God’s sanctuary. The psalmist does not say “happy I whom you choose” and not even “happy we whom you choose”. The praying psalmist uses the third person (“he whom you choose”), as if he himself were not included among the chosen. From this third person singular, he switches straight to the first person plural “we” (suffix נַנְ-). The “I” is omitted ⁸.

This is all the more remarkable because of the fact that, in verses 2-4, the “I”-character is involved in the movement from the third person (“all flesh”) to the first person plural (“our transgression”). Concerning the election by God with regard to his sanctuary, the first person singular “I” is however not used.

Here, the first person plural “we” is not used just like that. Whereas concerning the third person it is stated that he has been chosen, only the modal form is used concerning the “we”: “let us satisfy ourselves”. The realization of the wish of the “we” is still left open.

The “I”-character neither claims the election nor the sanctuary. By using the modal form of the “we”-form, the psalmist expresses that making any claim whatsoever, i.e. any appropriation, is impossible.

⁷ See also J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible at the Interface of Prosody and Structural Analysis* (SSN 41; Assen 2000) 115; G. RAVASI, *Il Libro dei Salmi* (Bologna 1983) II, 307.

⁸ See also J. CLINTON MCCANN, “The Shape of Book I of the Psalter and the Shape of Human Happiness”, *The Book of Psalms. Composition and Reception* (eds. P.W. FLINT – P.D. MILLER) (VTS 99; Leiden 2005) 346, who points out that neither an “I” nor a “we” can be connected to a beatitude.

In the first main unit, the “I” becomes a “we”, but the actual realization of this transition has not taken place yet. In the second main unit, this realization is touched upon in verse 10. I have already mentioned the special relationship between the verb “to fix” and the noun “wheat” from a semantic point of view. However, there is more. Whereas elsewhere in the second main unit the possessive suffix second person masculine singular is used, a different possessive suffix is used in verse 10d. Because of this, this possessive suffix attains a remarkable significance. After what occurs in the first main unit, the “we” is expected to possess the fertile land. This means that a first person plural suffix is expected to be used. The text, however, does not say: “you fix our wheat”. It speaks about דגנָם “their wheat”⁹. This means that the psalmist views the fertile land as the result of God’s liberating activity¹⁰, as it were, from the outside. He uses the third person “their” instead of the first person “our”. The ideal décor is not appropriated by the “I”-character. The prayer of Psalm 65, therefore, remains non-appropriative¹¹.

In my view, this non-appropriative attitude of the “I”-character is the clue to answering the diachronic question for the dating of Psalm 65 as well. Diachronic relations cannot be determined on the

⁹ The possessive suffix “their” is hardly discussed in the exegetical literature. If it is, the suffix is very often interpreted as referring to people in general; see for example M.E. TATE, *Psalms 51-100* (WBC 20; Waco, TX 1990) 137. This interpretation already occurs in Jewish exegesis; see for example M.I. GRUBER, *Rashi’s Commentary on Psalms* (Philadelphia, PA 2007) 438. In the text tradition, however, only the Syrohexapla reads την πανσπερμειαν αὐτης, which supposes דגנָה as the Hebrew text, with a third person feminine singular suffix, referring to the feminine noun דארץ the earth (v. 10a). TATE, *Psalms 51-100*, 137 even leaves the possibility open that the ה is just an enclitic ה without any further meaning.

¹⁰ See S. GILLMAYR-BUCHER, “Images of Space in the Psalms of Ascent”, *The Composition of the Books of Psalms* (ed. E. ZENGER) (BETL 238; Leuven 2010) 497, who points out that the spatial décor is not a partner in the communication, but that God is.

¹¹ The indications of the genre of Psalm 65 as ‘thanksgiving psalm’ or ‘hymn of praise for the harvest’, therefore, are not adequate, *pace*, among many others, D.J.A. CLINES, “Psalm Research since 1955: the Literary Genres”, *TynBul* 20 (1969) 113, 115; J. DAY, *Psalms* (OTG; Sheffield 1992) 112. See also the critical remarks by R.D. MILLER, “The Origin of the Zion Hymns”, *The Composition of the Books of Psalms* (ed. E. ZENGER) (BETL 238; Leuven 2010) 667-668.

basis of a direct connection between text-internal semantics and the text-external world. Moreover, semantic concepts such as “temple” and “fertility”, as found in Psalm 65, are too general to function as a solid basis for an answer to the diachronic question. In my view the text-internal communication does form a basis for this ¹². Psalm 65 is characterized by the non-appropriation of the “I”-character. The question to ask should therefore be: in which historic period does this text-internal communication fit best?

There is an ongoing discussion whether Psalm 65 is a polemic against the Canaanite rain-deity Baal. Because of the fact that the Lord is represented as giving the rain, this polemic against Baal is often thought to be intended. If this polemic is supposed, Psalm 65 must be pre-exilic. The simple observation, however, that both ‘rain’ words and the name of God occur in a psalm, is not enough to assume a polemic against Baal; in fact, there are no polemic expressions used in Psalm 65 at all ¹³.

In my view, Psalm 65 goes beyond this polemic, exactly because of the prominent role the mechanism of non-appropriation plays in the psalm’s text-internal communication. This communicative setting fits best in the post-exilic time with the experience that neither the sanctuary of the Lord nor the Land can be automatically possessed, i.e. appropriated. Accordingly, Psalm 65, at least in its present form, is in my opinion a post-exilic psalm ¹⁴.

III. The text-internal reader in Psalm 65

A reader is present in every text ¹⁵. Normally, this text-internal reader is not made explicit. Some genres, however, are character-

¹² A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, *The Reader-Oriented Unity of the Book of Isaiah* (ACEBT SS 6; Vught 2006) 6-7; 205-212.

¹³ See S. SCHROER, “Psalm 65 – Zeugnis eines integrativen JHWH-Glaubens?”, *UF* 22 (1990) 300-301; *pace*, among others, H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (BKAT 15/1; Neukirchen 1960) 453; SEDLMEIER, *Jerusalem*, 271-272.

¹⁴ Cf. also RAVASI, *Salmi*, 303.

¹⁵ See VAN WIERINGEN, *Reader-Oriented Unity*, 3-7; A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, “Communicatiegeoriënteerde exegese en tekstuele identiteit geïllustreerd aan het boek Amos”, *Theologie & Methode* (ed. A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN) (Theologische Perspectieven Supplement Series 4; Bergambacht 2012) especially 26-41, and the bibliography mentioned there.

ized by addressing the text-internal reader at the end of the text, for example in a fairy tale. In the Bible, the text-internal reader is only addressed explicitly in a few texts. The most famous example is John 20,30-31 ¹⁶. The narrator here remarks that, although there is more to tell about Jesus, the stories in his Gospel are enough for you, dear readers, to believe in Jesus Christ. Of course, this does not mean that every reader will believe at the end of chapter 20, but, from the perspective of the text, the text-internal reader cannot do anything else but believe.

Psalm 65 also contains a text-internal reader. This text-internal reader is not directly addressed anywhere in the text. The text-internal reader is kept hidden, and this is significant. Psalm 65 creates a position for the text-internal reader parallel to the textual position of the "I"-character, which is almost hidden in the text of Psalm 65 as well. The main aspect of the position of this "hidden" "I"-character is its non-appropriation. The "hidden" text-internal reader is considered to have the same position. What the "I"-character does not do, may not do and cannot do in view of his prayer-relationship to God, namely appropriating for himself being chosen and, subsequently, appropriating for himself the ideal Promised Land, the text-internal reader may not do either.

Instead of addressing the text-internal reader directly, the text offers an indirect access. This can be observed twice in the text of Psalm 65. The text-internal reader's first access is offered in verse 3b, "to you, all flesh comes". The expression "all flesh" has a universal aspect: it indicates every human being, fragile and mortal. If every human being belongs to the expression "all flesh" in Psalm 65, the text-internal reader can consider himself to be one of them as well.

If the text-internal reader does indeed do so, the text-internal reader has access to the text even before the "I"-verse (= verse 4). However, the text-internal reader has yet to go through the non-appropriating development of the "I"-character. The text-internal reader walks along with the "I"-character, as it were, and is likewise taught not to fall into the trap of self-appropriation.

¹⁶ Another example is Isa 7,9c-d in which the text-internal reader is addressed by the prophet, resulting in a parallel communication between the characters Isaiah and Ahaz, on the one hand, and the prophet and the text-internal reader, on the other hand; see VAN WIERINGEN, *Implied Reader*, 72-74.

This universal position of “all flesh”, into which the text-internal reader is invited, is supported by the word אֶרֶץ used in verse 10. The addressed “you” has visited the אֶרֶץ. This Hebrew word, however, can indicate both the “land”, namely the Land Israel, and the “earth”, namely all lands. From the perspective of the “I”-character, the Land is in focus here: the movement of zooming out and zooming in around God’s location, namely Zion, evokes the Promised Land Israel. However, from the perspective of the text-internal reader’s access, all flesh is involved. By this, the Promised Land of the “I”-character is expanded to include the entire earth, and in doing so the mechanism of non-appropriation is expanded to include the entire world.

The second possible access to the text for the text-internal reader is the use of the first person plural in Psalm 65. The first person plural starts with the forgiveness of “our transgressions” in verse 4 and, subsequently, takes shape in the wish “let us satisfy ourselves” concerning God’s sanctuary in verse 5 and in the indication of God as “God of our deliverance” in verse 6. The text-internal reader may consider himself to be a part of the “we”, i.e. the community which arises in the development of the “I”-character.

This implies that the text-internal reader also has access to the text after the “I”-verse (= verse 4). The text-internal reader is present in the text after the “I”-character has taken up his position. Because of that, the “I”-character is ahead of the text-internal reader, which means that the “I”-character already knows about the non-appropriation.

On the basis of both accesses to the text, the text-internal reader will never expect “our wheat” instead of דגנם “their wheat” in verse 10d. This is an enormous difference compared to the easy-going modern translations ¹⁷ and exegeses found on the Internet ¹⁸, in which a direct link is made between praying Psalm 65 and the abundant harvest of wheat.

¹⁷ For example, the so-called Dutch Bronkhorst-translation of 1969, which was the translation used in the first post-conciliar breviary in the Netherlands: “You have cared and irrigated our land / and made it rich and fertile // the rainwaters stream down over the fields: / so you make them ready for the harvest” (my translation). See also the adopted translation of the NKJV: “you visit and care for the earth and water it, you greatly enrich it; your river is full of water; you provide *our* grain, for so you have prepared it”.

¹⁸ For example, among many other websites: www.hurtingchristian.org, which interprets the text as “it is God that prepares abundance for us”.

IV. The “I”-character becomes “David” in the heading of Psalm 65

The heading of Psalm 65 reads “to the choirmaster, a psalm concerning David, a song”. For my analysis, the proper name David is important. Normally, the construction לְדָוִד is interpreted as being an indication of the author: “a psalm (written) by David”. Even though this is not necessarily to be understood in a historical way, it would be, in my view, an inadequate interpretation. The prepositional phrase with ל can indicate the actor only in the case of a passive verbal form being used, for instance: לְבָרַךְ (Gen 14,17) “blessed by”. The preposition ל never marks the subject of an active verbal form. Regarding the semantic field of the preposition ל, the interpretation “concerning” is preferable¹⁹. The poem is not David’s, but wishes to tell something concerning David. The proper name in the Psalm’s heading is of theological significance.

Due to this heading, the “I”-character receives a proper name. The “I”-character is no longer anonymous; his name is “David”. Many expressions in Psalm 65 allude to David, especially by alluding to texts in the narrative books of Samuel.

The image of the shepherd is evoked in Psalm 65 by the pastures and the steppes for the cattle or sheep. According to 1 Sam 17,28.34-36 and 2 Sam 7,8, this is the location from which the Lord took David to be the leader of his people, to be the good shepherd of the people of God. The word “steppe” is used in 1 Sam 17,28 and in Ps 65,13; the word “cattle” in 1 Sam 17,28.34, 2 Sam 7,8 and in Ps 65,14. The word “grain” in Ps 65,14 and “grazing land” in 2 Sam 7,8 can be considered to be synonyms.

Next, the theme of rest given by the Lord is expressed in 1 Sam 7,9-11. The Land will not have to fear any disturbance from all its enemies. In Psalm 65, this image of rest and calm is described in verse 8. The poetic image of the roaring seas is used to describe the dangerously roaring nations. God has silenced them.

Lastly, the theme of sin and forgiveness is not unfamiliar in the narratives concerning David. David commits adultery. The prophet Nathan very tactically reprimands David in 2 Sam 12,1-15. As soon as David confesses his sin, Nathan expresses God’s forgiveness.

¹⁹ Cf. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (ed. D.J.A. CLINES) (Sheffield 1998) 482, 484.

Besides the synonyms טָאָה / פָּשָׁא for sin and עָבַר / כָּפַר for forgiveness, which are used respectively in 2 Sam 12,13 and Ps 65,4, the most striking parallel is the direct connection between confession and forgiveness.

However, there are more connections. In the prophetic texts, there is a correlation between peace and harvest related to the proper name David, which can be found in Psalm 65 as well.

In Isa 8,23c – 9,6, a new leader is born to the people. In verse 5, the newborn child receives special throne names: “Deviser of wonderfulness, Heroic mighty one, Father of eternity, Ruler of peace”. Although the word מֶלֶךְ “king” cannot be positively used within the prophecy of Isaiah in view of the failure of King Ahaz, the text prevents any misunderstanding that this new son will not live up to the ideal of King David. The last throne name “Ruler of peace” is elaborated in verse 6: “there will be no end to the peace connected to the throne of David”. To express this peace, the new birth is described by using the image of the harvest in verse 2: the people rejoice as they do at the jubilation concerning the harvest. In the ancient Near East, harvest failure was caused not only by drought but also by war. When an army marched through the fields, the fields would yield no harvest. Harvest, therefore, means peace²⁰.

This connection between peace and harvest can be found in Psalm 65 as well. After the nations have been silenced (first main unit), a fertile land is described (second main unit), which implies a rich harvest. From the first harvest (barley) to the last harvest (wheat), the fruits of the land are guaranteed.

In Jer 23,5, this image of harvest and the new David is intensified²¹. The new David himself is represented as a sprout. This word “sprout” connects Ps 65,11 and Jer 23,5.

²⁰ Cf. SCHROER, “Psalm 65”, 286, who discusses the common agricultural words in Psalm 65 and Isaiah 55, although without mentioning the proper name דָּוִד in Isa 55,3.

²¹ For the meaning of “new”, see A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN, “The Theologoumenon ‘New’: Bridging the Old and the New Testament”, *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (eds. S. MOYISE – J. VERHEYDEN – B.J. KOET) (NTS 148; Leiden 2013) 285-301.

V. The “I”-character acts as the “David” in the heading of Psalm 65

Now that the “I”-character has received the features of David due to the heading of the Psalm, a new window onto the mechanism of non-appropriation opens up. The semantic parallels between Psalm 65 and the David narrations in the books of Samuel make it clear that self-appropriation is not the road David is allowed to travel. When he appropriates to himself the wife of someone else, this is regarded as a sin. His confession, however, leads to forgiveness. When he plans to build a house for the Lord, appropriating, as it were, the Lord’s temple, God makes it clear that not David but God himself will build a house and that David is not allowed to self-appropriate the task of building the temple.

The semantic parallels between Psalm 65 and David are even stronger. According to the theology of the *Ketuvim*, David becomes the ideal king. In this capacity, he receives the features of a second Moses: just as Moses sees the Promised Land but does not enter into it, so David announces the building of the temple but does not build the house of God himself.

A comparison between the descriptions of the commencement of the construction of the temple in 1 Kgs 6,1 and in 2 Chr 3,1-2 makes this new vision clear. In 1 Kgs 6,1, the date of the start of the construction of the temple is connected to the exodus from Egypt. In this way, the plot which starts in the book of Exodus reaches its completion. 2 Chr 3,1-2 instead contains a connection to David by using the proper name David, even twice: the location of the house of God is the location where the Lord appeared to David; the location of the house of God is the location which has been designated by David himself; however, David himself is not the one who builds the house of God ²².

David plays the part of a second Moses here, parallel to the part of the “I”-character in Psalm 65. Just as the “I”-character in Psalm 65 can neither appropriate being chosen nor appropriate the Prom-

²² Cf. R.K. DUKE, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler*. A Rhetorical Analysis (JSOT.S 88; Sheffield 1990) 63; for the location of the temple in Chronicles, see also S.J. SCHWEITZER, “The Temple in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles”, *Rewriting the Biblical History* (eds. J. CORLEY – H. VAN GROL) (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 7; Berlin 2011) 133-134.

ised Land, neither can Moses enter the Promised Land nor can David build the house of God.

The Psalter as a whole appears to express this theology of non-appropriation as well. After Psalm 72, the comment follows: “here end the prayers of David, the son of Jesse” (v. 20). Indeed, Psalms 1–72 contain many so-called “David” psalms, certainly in comparison with the rest of the Psalter ²³.

The last psalm before this comment, Psalm 72, describes the king in Jerusalem, using images which occur in Psalm 65 as well. In verses 3 and 7, the theme of peace and calm is used, guaranteeing a government without violence and war. The “mountains” and “hills” are bearers of this peace, as, in Psalm 65, the “mountains” are bearers of the earth in verse 7 and the “hills” are bearers of the jubilation about the fertility of the land in verse 13. This fertility is expressed in Psalm 72 as well, especially in verse 16 using the word “grain” as in verse 14 in Psalm 65.

Moreover, Psalm 72 contains a movement of zooming out. Verse 8 states that the king may have dominion from sea to sea and from the river to the extremities of the earth. The indications “ends of the earth” and “sea” occur in verse 6 in Psalm 65 as well. In Psalm 72, these most remote edges of the earth are concretized in the topographical proper names Tarshish, Sheba and Seba in verse 10. Tarshish is very often identified with the Iberian Peninsula, and Sheba and Seba with the Horn of Africa.

Psalm 72 does not only zoom out regarding the spatial décor, but also regarding the aspect of time. The king may reign as long as the sun and the moon endure (v. 5; see also verses 7 and 17). These indications evoke the morning and the evening mentioned in verse 9 in Psalm 65, although used with a spatial meaning.

These semantic parallels between Psalms 65 and 72 evoke the question whether the theology of non-appropriation can be found in Psalm 72 as well. Here, the heading of Psalm 72 is an important clue. It simply reads: “concerning Solomon”. Although the psalm is about the ideal king, the heading does not mention David, but rather Solomon. This is all the more striking because of the comment following this psalm, namely that the prayers of David have come to an end, whereas the prayer of Psalm 72 itself is not connected to the proper name of David.

²³ See also HOSSFELD – ZENGER, *Psalmen 51-100*, 314.

What does the Psalter wish to make clear here? Psalm 72 indicates that the ideal king, David, does not appropriate the kingship to himself. Maybe Psalm 72 even goes a step further and identifies the ideal kingship beyond David by mentioning the proper name of Solomon. In this way, Psalm 72 rejects self-appropriation and, parallel to Psalm 65, opens the window onto a theology of non-appropriation.

VI. The “I”-character and the heading of Psalm 65(64) in the Vulgate

In the text tradition, headings of psalms change and develop very often. This is also the case in Psalm 65(64). The Vulgate contains a different heading from the Hebrew text: *canticum Hieremiae et Ezechielis populo transmigrationis cum inciperent exire*; “a song of Jeremiah and Ezekiel to the people of the exile when they began to depart”²⁴. The song is connected to two prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, meant for the people in exile, at a very specific moment, namely at the start of their return out of exile.

From the perspective of the exile, the names of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel are significant. Jeremiah is the prophet *par excellence* regarding the beginning of the exile and the deportation to Babel. At the very beginning of Jeremiah, in 1,3, the exile is already mentioned, and verse 27 of the final chapter repeats the exile. The start of the exile, therefore, forms an inclusion of the entire book of Jeremiah. Ezekiel, on the other hand, is the prophet *par excellence* regarding the beginning of the end of the exile. According to 1,2, the book of Ezekiel starts in the exile, but the spatial décor is transferred to Jerusalem very quickly. The prophet sees how God prepares everything to make the return out of exile possible. One of God’s activities in Jerusalem, to which the people must return out of exile, is the building of the ideal temple. In Psalm 65, this longing for the temple can be found in verse 5.

²⁴ This heading goes back to the heading of Psalm 65(64) in the Septuagint; *pace*, among others, F. DELITZSCH, *Psalms* (Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids, MI 1982) 226, who believes that this heading makes no sense.

In the conceptual world of the ancient Near East, a temple is always connected to life-giving water²⁵. Within the Psalter, this standard idiom is most explicitly present in Psalm 46: “our God is like a firm stronghold in Jerusalem, in which a river gladdens the city” (v. 4). When, in the Book of Ezekiel, the new temple is constructed in chapters 40–42, and the altar is consecrated and the priests and Levites are able to perform their liturgical tasks once again, in chapter 47, a stream of water flows out of the sanctuary, which revives the entire region, even the once barren Arabah, with water for trees which will ensure a rich harvest every month²⁶.

This combination of temple and water can be found in Psalm 65 as well. The “courts”, the “house” and the “temple” are used as desirable locations in verse 5, whereas the ‘water’ is present in the “canal of God”, the temple river, in verse 10.

Elsewhere in the prophetic literature, the end of the exile is described by using words which occur in Psalm 65 as well. The image of the “sprout” (v. 11) is used in Isa 4,2 to indicate the remnant of Israel. In Isa 61,11, the word “sprout” is used again to describe God’s liberating activity of redemption from the exile: just as the sprout is brought forth by the earth, so does God redeem.

The verb “to drip” (verses 12–13) occurs in prophecies as well as in descriptions of the end of the exile. In Isa 45,8 a shower from the heavens, God’s abode, is combined with words denoting vegetation: the earth will bear the fruit of salvation and righteousness will sprout.

What communication arises in Psalm 65(64) from this prophetic perspective in the Vulgate? The “I”-character becomes a prophetic “I”-character, in which Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the prophets mentioned in the heading, converge. The “I”-character experiences the exile, both the beginning and the end, and, therefore, has gone through it in its entirety. As a consequence, the “we” that arises consists of the people of God and its prophets.

Against this background, the expression “our transgressions” in verse 4 refers to the wicked behaviour which caused the decline and destruction of Jerusalem and its temple and, consequently, the deportation into exile. The nations in verse 8 refer to the foreign

²⁵ Cf. KEEL, *Bildsymbolik*, 122.

²⁶ Cf. also Revelation 21–22.

peoples who deported God's people into exile. The forgiveness, therefore, implies the end of the exile.

The "I"-character is situated in verse 4, on the one hand, at the moment at which the transgressions belong to the past and, on the other hand, at the moment of being forgiven. Through this forgiveness, the entire community arises. The Latin heading positions the psalm at this very pivotal point: it is a song for the community in exile at the very moment they are starting to return out of exile.

The temple in verse 5 becomes the new temple, the second temple, built after the Babylonian Exile. The fertile land in the second main unit is the Promised Land to which the deportees return.

What about the theology of non-appropriation in the re-reading of Psalm 65(64) in the Vulgate? The return out of exile does not mean that entering the temple and the Land can be claimed automatically. Returning out of exile, there is no occasion for self-appropriation. The temple is mentioned using a modal expression, which indicates a wish. The real access to God's promises occurs on the basis of being chosen by God. The land is fertile, but only because of God's rains and the water canal. The wheat is not allowed to be called "our wheat" but remains "their wheat" (in the Vulgate: *cibum illorum*), the wheat of all those whom God grants to live in the Land.

VII. The "I"-character and the liturgical use of Psalm 65

In the liturgy of the Roman rite, Psalm 65(64) has a specific place. It is the psalm of the introit of the funeral Mass. All the poetic verses (2-14) are allowed to be sung during the entrance of the liturgical celebration; however, usually only the first couple of lines are sung ²⁷.

Once again, a new communicative context arises due to the re-reading of the psalm. In the liturgy, the transgressions and forgive-

²⁷ Because of the fact that, in the liturgy of the Roman rite, the Latin text, usually the Vulgate, but after the Second Vatican Council also the Neo-Vulgate, a modern Bible translation in pre-Christian Latin, is used, the textual situation becomes even more complex for two reasons: a) the word "silence" in verse 2 is interpreted differently; b) the colometric structure of verses 2-3 in the Hebrew MT-text and in the Latin Vulgate-text are different (whereas the Neo-Vulgate offers a mixture, the Latin interpretation of the Vulgate contains the colometric structure of the MT).

ness in verse 4 sound like a kind of last judgment. The temple in Psalm 65(64) alludes to the temple in the new Jerusalem, in which the Lord God himself is the temple, along with the Lamb, as described in Rev 21,22. The fertile land in the second main unit assumes the shape of paradise in the hereafter²⁸. Subsequently, those who are rejoicing and singing at the end of the psalm in verse 14c are the inhabitants of paradise.

The word “silence” in the first colon of verse 2 could be understood as receiving a new meaning²⁹. Within the context of the funeral Mass, the word “silence” can be considered as a synonym for death. In Ps 94,17, the “silence” is the image of the grave. In Ps 115,17 “all those who went down into silence” refers to the dead³⁰.

However, a different silence than the silence of death can be meant here, all the more because of the fact that the Sheol is no part of the continuation of the psalm but rather a paradisiacal land. The silence is therefore the expression of the awe for God. In Isa 6,5, the prophet Isaiah testifies to this silence, after having seen the Lord sitting on a high and exalted throne. The direct contact with God causes Isaiah to admit his impurity. His confession evokes a forgiveness ritual which is executed by one of the Seraphs: by using a glowing ember from the altar, Isaiah’s impurity is burnt away, and his sins are wiped away. This silence, as self-knowledge, which evokes forgiveness (v. 6), fits in with the continuation in 65(64),4, in which the “I”-character confesses his misdeeds, which now belong to the past, and receives forgiveness. The reception of Psalm 65(64) in the liturgy implies that the psalm is sung at a pivotal moment of the funeral Mass.

The theology of non-appropriation is part of the reception as well. Two reading possibilities occur, which are simultaneously valid within the liturgical use of Psalm 65(64).

²⁸ For the image of paradise and Psalm 65, see also B. JANOWSKI, “Das Licht des Lebens: Zur Lichtmetaphorik in den Psalmen”, *Metaphors in the Psalms* (eds. P. VAN HECKE – A. LABAHN) (BETL 231; Leuven 2010) 109-110.

²⁹ For the interpretation of silence, see also TATE, *Psalms 51-100*, 136; M. BERNSTEIN, “A Jewish Reading of Psalms: Some Observations on the Method of the Aramaic Targum”, *The Book of Psalms. Composition and Reception* (eds. P.W. FLINT – P.D. MILLER) (VTS 99; Leiden 2005) 483.

³⁰ Using the word נִשְׁיָה “forgetfulness”, Ps 88,12 expresses the silence of the dead as well.

The “I”-character can be identified with the deceased. If this is the case, the deceased one prays the psalm. He is aware of the fact that he cannot appropriate for himself everlasting bliss, paradise. He is open to God, and, now knowing about the forgiveness of his sins, he speaks about access to the Land and the temple as a desire, of which the fulfilment can be expected from God alone. Nobody can appropriate anything at the crisis of death.

A dead person however cannot in fact speak; the psalm of the funeral Mass is therefore sung by the assembled community. In that case, the reception does not take place at the level of the “I”-character, but at the level of the “we”. In Psalm 65(64), the “I”-character becomes visible only in the “we”. In this way, the praying assembly makes the deceased visible before God’s face. It is not the “I”-character who appropriates paradise but rather the “we” who gives him, in Christ, access to the promised, paradisiacal land.

Both reading possibilities fit well into the structure of the funeral Mass. Just as the liturgy begins with the image of paradise, using the profession of the non-appropriation, so the liturgy is concluded by the antiphon “*in paradisum*”, without cancelling out the non-appropriation. In this antiphon, paradise is represented, into which the angels may accompany the deceased, and elaborated by the expression of the holy city (*civitas sancta*) of Jerusalem, into which the martyrs may carry the deceased. In Ps 65(64),5, the word “*sanctum*” is used for the temple (*sanctum est templum tuum*, “holy is your temple”). In the Vulgate, in contrast to the Hebrew text, the proper name Jerusalem is present in verse 2. In this way, the fertile land, paradise, in all its richness, forms an inclusion of the funeral Mass in the liturgy of the Roman rite.



The communicative setting of Psalm 65 is characterized by a theology of non-appropriation for the “I”-character. The re-readings of Psalm 65, as expressed in the Vulgate and in the funeral liturgy according to the Roman rite, have continued this theology of non-appropriation. Psalm 65 teaches its readers that this theology of non-appropriation should be one of the basic attitudes of the faithful ³¹.

³¹ In fact, in the Christian tradition, the model of praying *psalmus vox totius Christi capitis et corporis ad Patrem in Spiritu* (“the psalm is the voice

It is wise to keep this in mind for any modern re-reading of this Psalm as well ³².

School of Catholic Theology
Tilburg University
5037 AB Tilburg, NL

A.L.H.M. van WIERINGEN

SUMMARY

The biblical perspective that a receiver of God's promises is not allowed to claim these promises is called non-appropriation theology. Psalm 65 can be read as an example of this non-appropriation theology. The "I"-character does not claim the fertile Land but can only speak about the abundance of the harvest of their wheat (v. 10). The heading of Psalm 65, identifying the "I"-character as David, preserves the non-appropriation theology. This non-appropriation theology is retained in the reception-history of Psalm 65, as can be found in the Septuagint and the liturgical use of Psalm 65 in the funeral Mass.

of the entire Christ, head and limbs, to the Father, in the Spirit"), which goes back to Augustine (354-430), has been largely succeeded by the model of praying *psalmus vox monachorum ad Deum Patrem, Filium et Spiritum* ("the psalm is the voice of the monks to God Father, Son and Spirit"), which originates from Benedict (480-547). In the latter view, not only has the dynamics of the Trinity disappeared, but also a direct identification takes place between the voice of the persons praying and the voice of the psalm, which is at odds with the theology of non-appropriation found in Psalm 65. See also: B. FISCHER, *Die Psalmen als Stimme der Kirche: Gesammelte Studien zur christlichen Psalmenfrömmigkeit* (Trier 1982) especially 85-95. For the difference of the interpretation of the Psalms in the Christian tradition of the first three centuries and in the Christian tradition of the fourth and fifth century, see also M. COLLIN, "*Comme un murmure de cithare*". Introduction aux Psaumes (Paris 2008) 55-68, 91.

³² I am greatly indebted to Drs. Maurits J. Sinninghe Damsté (Musselkanaal, Netherlands) for his correction of the English translation of this article.

Die Entstehung der juda-exilischen Hoseaschrift

Archäologische Funde zeigen das letzte Viertel des 8. Jh. v.Chr. als Phase intensiver Schriftlichkeit in Palästina ¹. In Juda werden nach der assyrischen Eroberung Israels (720 v.Chr.) neben judäischen auch israelitische Schrifttypen verwendet. Solche Funde ergänzen das Bild einer wirtschaftlichen und bevölkerungspolitischen Entwicklung Judas nach dem Untergang Israels durch israelitische Flüchtlinge ². Sie unterstützen die These, dass die Tradition der schriftprophetischen Verkündigung von Hosea und Amos in Israel nach 720 v.Chr. von israelitischen Tradenten im Fluchtland Juda literarisch bearbeitet und fertiggestellt wurde.

Dieser Aufsatz setzt meine Untersuchungen zu einer juda-exilischen israelitischen Entstehungsgeschichte der Amosschrift fort ³. Nicht das babylonische Exil Judas ab 597/586 v.Chr., wie gewöhnlich vermutet wird, sondern bereits die Flucht von Israeliten nach Juda seit Beginn assyrischer Annexionen im syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg 734/733 v.Chr. löste das Verlangen nach schriftlich fixierter und reflektierter Glaubenstradition aus. Insbesondere die ältere schriftprophetische Literatur visiert zugleich judäische und (vorrangig) israelitische Zielgruppen in Juda an ⁴. Ich unterstelle ihr, dass sie im Kern eine israelitische, im Fluchtland Juda verfasste, religiöse Literatur ist, die sich mit der Politik des Zufluchtslandes und einer erhofften Rückkehr nach Israel selbst auseinandersetzt. Die An-

¹ J. RENZ, "Die vor- und außerliterarische Texttradition. Ein Beitrag der palästinischen Epigraphik zur Vorgeschichte des Kanons", *Die Textualisierung der Religion* (ed. J. SCHAPER) (FAT 62; Tübingen 2009) 53-81.

² Dazu vgl. I. FINKELSTEIN – N.A. SILBERMAN, "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology", *JSOT* 30 (2006) 259-285. Siehe auch F. STAVRAKOPOULOU, *King Manasseh and Child Sacrifice* (BZAW 338; Berlin 2004) 73-99.

³ W. SCHÜTTE, "Israels Exil in Juda und die Völkersprüche in Am 1-2", *Bib* 92 (2011) 528-553, DERS., "Die Amosschrift als juda-exilische israelitische Komposition", *Bib* 93 (2012) 520-542.

⁴ Zu grundsätzlichen literaturhistorischen Erwägungen eines israelitischen Exils in Juda s. W. SCHÜTTE, "Wie wurde Juda israelitisiert?", *ZAW* 124 (2012) 52-72.

nahme eines speziell israelitischen Sammler- und Redaktorenkreises in Juda bietet eine einleuchtende Erklärung, warum etliche Schriften des Tanach viel israelitische und nur wenig spezifisch jüdische Tradition erzählen ⁵. Dies kann für jahrhundertlang in Juda tradierte Schriften nicht als selbstverständlich angenommen werden. Denn die Geschichte von Israel und Juda in ihren historischen, palästinischen Ursprüngen ist zunächst je für sich zu betrachten ⁶. Die biblischen Erzählungen vom Großreich David bleiben archäologisch unbewiesen und stellen nach heutigem Kenntnisstand ein literarisches Konstrukt dar ⁷. Waren die Staaten Israel und Juda während der Zeit ihres Bestehens auch mehrmals politisch eng verknüpft und in vielen Lebensbereichen eng verbandelt, so erlauben die Erzählungen des Tanach heute nicht länger mehr einen Schluss auf eine ursprüngliche, und sei es vorstaatliche Einheit beider Königtümer ⁸.

Das Jesajabuch setzt bereits im Grundbestand der protojesajani-schen Textüberlieferung einen Verschmelzungsprozess jüdischer und israelitischer Traditionen voraus ⁹. Anders zeigen sich die Überlieferungen der beiden anderen Schriftpropheten des 8. Jh. v.Chr., Hosea und Amos. Ein genuin israelitischer Erzähllintergrund wird vorsichtig in einen neuen, jüdischen Kontext gestellt ¹⁰. Hosea- und Amosschrift dürften bereits im beginnenden 7. Jh. v.Chr. abgefasst worden sein.

⁵ Ein weiteres Indiz für diese Annahme bilden späte Erinnerungen an die nationale Bedeutung von Assyrien für Israels Geschichte (z.B. Sach 10,10; Esr 6,22). Nicht das babylonische Exil Juda-Israels, sondern das ältere assyrische Exil Israels bildet auch den Hintergrund der Jonageschichte und von Tobit. Ebenso ist 1/2 Kön als Darstellung der Geschichte *Israels* angesichts der Katastrophe von 720 v.Chr. komponiert und mehrmals redigiert worden. Sie begriff die erneute Katastrophe von 586 v.Chr. als eine (minder dramatische) Wiederholung der Geschichte von 720 v.Chr., die Gottes Zusage an Israel nicht aufhob; vgl. W. SCHÜTTE, "David, König Israels. Zum 'Prophetenschweigen' im DtrG", *BZ* 57 (2013) 97-110.

⁶ Vgl. die pointierte Darstellung in I. FINKELSTEIN – N.A. SILBERMAN, *Keine Posaunen vor Jericho* (München 2002) 167-187.

⁷ M. HUBER, *Gab es ein davidisch-salomisches Großreich?* (SBB 64; Stuttgart 2010); SCHÜTTE, "Amosschrift", 536-539. Allerdings scheint man in Israel Davidtraditionen gepflegt zu haben (Am 6,5).

⁸ R.G. KRATZ, "Israel als Staat und Volk", *ZThK* 97 (2000) 1-17.

⁹ R.G. KRATZ, "Israel im Jesajabuch", *Prophetenstudien* (FAT 74; Tübingen 2011) 160-176.

¹⁰ Zur Amosschrift vgl. SCHÜTTE, "Völkerversprüche", und DERS., "Amosschrift".

Während die Amosschrift im Gefolge der Hoseaschrift ihre literarisch erhaltene Form bekam, läßt die Hoseaschrift selbst ein vorausgegangenes, schrittweises Wachstum erkennen¹¹. Darin spiegeln sich Vorgänge in der israelitischen Geschichte vor und nach 720 v.Chr., die auf die späteren Schriften des Tanach großen Einfluss nehmen sollten. Das Dodekapropheton eröffnet mit der Hoseaschrift und zeigt so an, wie bedeutsam dieser Text für die Ausbildung weiterer israelitischer Exilliteratur in Juda war.

I. Ein Zugang zur Hoseaschrift

Wie geht es weiter mit Israel? Mit dieser Frage beschäftigt sich die Hoseaschrift. Der hos. Hoffnung für Israel hat J. Jeremias vor langer Zeit eine Untersuchung der Wurzel שׁוּב gewidmet¹². Er zeigt die facettenreiche Verwendung von שׁוּב als "Abkehr" oder "Rückkehr" auf, die insbesondere in den vier von Hoffnungsaussagen geprägten Kapiteln Hosea 2; 3; 11 und 14 das Handeln Israels und Gottes bestimmt. Als ein Verb der Bewegung¹³ trifft שׁוּב / "sich wenden" aber nicht nur eine zielgerichtete Aussage, wovon oder wohin sich jemand kehrt. In seinem Kern setzt שׁוּב immer eine Begegnung voraus, die aufgegeben oder erneuert wird. Insofern erscheint es mir überzeugender, in der Hoseaschrift שׁוּב als Leitmotiv nicht mit Jeremias unter dem Gedanken der Eschatologie zu fassen, sondern die hos. Aussagen ausgehend von der Begegnung Gottes und der Menschen her zu verstehen, und von dem Grundaxiom theologischen Nachdenkens her zu erschließen: "Die Erkenntnis Gottes und die Selbsterkenntnis stehen in Beziehung zueinander"¹⁴.

Gotteserkenntnis und Selbsterkenntnis sind unauflöslich miteinander verknüpft. Soweit eines das andere bedingt, läßt sich philosophisch die Frage nach dem beziehungsstiftenden Anfang stellen. Gleichzeitig setzt das Erheben dieser Frage hermeneutisch stets schon

¹¹ J. JEREMIAS, "Die Anfänge des Dodekapropheton: Hosea und Amos", *Hosea und Amos* (FAT 13; Tübingen 1996) 34-54.

¹² J. JEREMIAS, "Zur Eschatologie des Hoseabuches", *Hosea und Amos* (FAT 13; Tübingen 1996) 67-85.

¹³ H.-J. FABRY, Art. שׁוּב, *TWAT* VII, 1121.

¹⁴ J. CALVIN, *Unterricht in der christliche Religion / Institutio Christianae Religionis* (ed. O. WEBER) (Neukirchen-Vluyn³1984) I,1.

eine Ortsbestimmung der fragenden Person innerhalb des benannten Beziehungszusammenhangs voraus. Die hos. Schriftprophetie zeigt eine solche Ortsbestimmung in kritischer Auseinandersetzung mit ihren Traditionen und mit neuen Antworten auf herausfordernde Fragen. Sie ringt um Klärung der Beziehung zwischen Gott und Mensch unter der Bedingung einer voranschreitenden Zeit, in der sich Lebenszusammenhänge ständig verändern. So dient sie der Vergewisserung von Menschen über ihre Gottesbeziehung. Als zeitverhaftete Vergewisserung wurde ihre Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis dennoch nicht bald von der Zeit überholt. Die Hoseaschrift bildet dies selbst ab, insofern sie redaktionsgeschichtlich ein Zusammenwachsen von mehreren Textstücken erkennen läßt. Theologiegeschichtlich erweist sie sich darin als ein alter, früh bewährter und reflektierter Glaubenstext, über den sich ein Nachdenken lohnt.

Die zeitgeschichtliche Einordnung hos. Texte ist allerdings strittig. Jeremias ordnet in seiner bereits erwähnten Untersuchung Texte großflächig dem historischen Propheten zu. Entweder sollen sie in die Zeit vor (Hos 4,1 – 5,7) oder nach dem syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg (Hosea 9–13[14]) oder in dessen Zusammenhang (Hos 5,8 – 8,13) gehören; aus Hosea 1–3 rechnete er Hosea 2 eher der Frühverkündigung, Hosea 3 dem späten Propheten zu¹⁵. Diese Bestimmungen dienen Jeremias dazu, um theologische Entwicklungen vor einem bestimmten gesellschaftlichen Hintergrund verständlich zu machen. Andere Analysen der Hoseaschrift arbeiten hingegen stärker kleinteiligere Textentwicklungen heraus, deren Schwerpunkt in nach(-babylon-)exilischer Zeit liegen soll¹⁶.

¹⁵ J. JEREMIAS, "Eschatologie", 70.71.74. Diese Einordnung relativiert J. JEREMIAS, "'Ich bin wie ein Löwe für Ephraim ...' (Hos 5,14). Aktualität und Allgemeinheit im prophetischen Reden von Gott – am Beispiel von Hos 5,8-14", *Hosea und Amos* (FAT 13; Tübingen 1996) 104-121, wenn er die Verschriftung der Prophetie als einen Akt beschreibt, welcher dem mündlich ergangenen Wort in späterer Zeit eine erhöhte und grundsätzlichere Bedeutung zuerkennt. W. GISIN, *Hosea. Ein literarisches Netzwerk beweist seine Authentizität* (BBB 139; Berlin 2002) 293.296 sieht ähnlich die Hoseaschrift von einem einzigen Autor um 728-725 v.Chr. verfasst.

¹⁶ Vgl. G.A. YEE, *Composition and Tradition in the Book of Hosea* (SBL.DS 102; Atlanta, GA 1987) und zuletzt vor allem S. RUDNIG-ZELT, *Redaktionskritische Untersuchungen zur Genese des Hoseabuches* (FRLANT 213; Göttingen 2006). J.M. TROTTER, *Reading Hosea in Achaemenid Yehud* (JSOTSS 328; Sheffield 2001), unternimmt es, die Hoseaschrift im Licht der persischen Zeit

Da die Beschreibung historischer theologischer Überlegungen nicht recht gelingen kann ohne deren Verortung in Raum und Zeit, geht meiner Darstellung theologischer Gedanken der Hoseaschrift zunächst eine Begründung voraus, in welcher Relation hos. Texte zueinander stehen dürften. Um diese Aufgabe zu lösen, scheinen mir “sudden changes in person and number, repetitions, expansions, or inconsistencies in thought”¹⁷ ungeeignete Kriterien für redaktionelle Scheidungen zu sein, da sie moderne Einschätzungen vor die Wahrnehmung eines alten Textes rücken und den Text über Gebühr zergliedern können. Näher steht mir der von W. Gisin verfolgte Weg, zunächst die Vernetzung des Textes durch bestimmte Worte, Bilder und Motive zu erschließen¹⁸. Anders als Gisin habe ich mich jedoch auf einige wenige, formale Signale beschränkt, die auf Texteinheiten hinweisen, sowie auf häufig im Text genannte Zielgruppen, deren Vorkommen und Funktion in ihrem Kontext untersucht wurde¹⁹.

Die aus der Textanalyse gewonnenen Einsichten werden genutzt, um synthetisch ein Bild der Weltsicht zu zeichnen, die hos. Tradenten zu ihrer Zeit entwickelten. Fokussiert möchte ich beschreiben, was nach hos. Verständnis aus einer zu- oder abkehrenden Begegnung von Gott und Mensch zu erhoffen ist.

zu interpretieren, denn “it is appropriate to indicate the general scholarly consensus that a reasonable *terminus ad quem* for the existence of the final form of the book permits such reading” (38). Auf diese Möglichkeit einer Textauslegung, die eine Grundvoraussetzung der *Tradition* der älteren Hoseaschrift ist und die sich als homiletische Aufgabe zu allen Zeiten seit deren Abfassung und bis heute stellt, soll hier nicht näher eingegangen werden. Wenn jedoch E. BEN ZVI, *Hosea* (FOTL XXI A/1; Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 12-19 diesen Gedanken dahin entwickelt “a postmonarchic setting for the present book of Hosea is more likely” (14), so soll seiner These mit meinem Gegenentwurf widersprochen werden.

¹⁷ So der kompositionskritische Leitfaden von YEE, *Composition*, 49.

¹⁸ Vgl. GISIN, *Hosea*, 7.19-24, und W. SCHÜTTE, *Säet euch Gerechtigkeit*. Adressaten und Anliegen der Hoseaschrift (BWANT 179; Stuttgart 2008) 23-26.

¹⁹ Die Ergebnisse des folgenden Kapitels sind ausführlich begründet in SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*. Gerade bei den von mir betrachteten Zielgruppen hat GISIN, *Hosea*, 47, zwischen Volksbezeichnungen und “Kinder” bzw. “Haus” plus Volksnamen nicht ausreichend differenziert. Diese Nivellierung hindert ihn, zeitgeschichtlich fassbare, redaktionelle Prozesse wahrzunehmen.

II. Die Textgliederung der Hoseaschrift

Es bestehen große Schwierigkeiten, einzelne Hoseatexte zeitlich einzuordnen. Abgesehen von einer historischen Bestimmung der hos. Verkündigung in Hos 1,1 findet sich keine zeitliche Näherbestimmung einzelner Worte. Der gesamte Text gibt kaum Hinweise, wie er nach seinem Aufbau zu verstehen sei. Allein Hos 3,1-5 wird von allen alten Textzeugen und der exegetischen Tradition als abgegrenzte Episode verstanden²⁰. So läßt sich in der Hoseaschrift nur grob ein von (pseudo?-)biographischem Material geprägter Anfang (Hosea 1–3) von schriftprophetischem Spruchgut (Hosea 4–14) unterscheiden. Bestimmte Textsignale jedoch erlauben eine weitere Aufgliederung.

Hosea 4–14 zeigt nur in Hos 11,11 eine formale Zäsur (נאם־יהוה / “Spruch JHWHs”), die von der masoretischen Tradition durch eine Petucha oder Setuma betont wird. F. Crüsemann hat gezeigt, dass sich die Rede von Hosea 4–11 durch den Gebrauch eines die gegenwärtige Situation betonenden עתה / “jetzt” aus dem Gesamttext heraushebt²¹. Da Hosea 4–11 wie Hosea 12–14 mit Hoffnungsworten schließen, drängt sich als nächstes die Frage auf, wie Gerichtsprophetie und Hoffnungsworte in einem gemeinsamen Text Hoffnung für Israel artikulieren. עתה wird aber allein in der Gerichtsprophetie von Hosea 4–10 verwendet und grenzt sie von dem hoffnungsvollen Schluß in Hosea 11 ab. Weitere Merkmale unterstützen diese Unterteilung. In Hosea 4–10 werden zwei unterscheidbare Zielgruppen angesprochen. Schon gleich zu Anfang wird in Hos 4,5-6 eine priesterliche Führungsperson mit “du” direkt angesprochen und in Hos 4,13-14 eine kultisch aktive Gruppe mit “ihr”. Diese zweifache Anrede wiederholt sich und kulminiert in der gemeinsamen Anrede beider Adressaten (Hos 10,12-15)²². Eine letzte Mahnung und noch-

²⁰ Vgl. W. SCHÜTTE, „Die Textgliederung der Hoseaschrift von Qumran bis zur Zürcher Bibel“ (erscheint in *Pericope*).

²¹ F. CRÜSEMANN, “עתה - jetzt. Hosea 4–11 als Anfang der Schriftprophetie”, *Kanon und Sozialgeschichte* (Gütersloh 2003) 131-145, schließt weiter aus dem in Hos 4,16; 5,3.7; 7,2; 8,8.10.13; 10,2.3 verwendeten עתה, dass dieser Textblock aktuelle Prophetenworte in schriftlich verfasster Form wiedergebe.

²² Direkte Anreden eines anonymen “du” in Hos 4,4-6.17; 8,1.5; 10,13-14; direkte Anreden einer anonymen Gruppe “ihr” in Hos 4,13-14; 5,13; 9,5; 10,12-13.15, vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 79-89.101-118.

malige Anklage von Verfehlungen der Adressaten gipfelt in der Ankündigung, dass Israels König verworfen werde. Mit diesen formalen Kennzeichen (עֲתֵה in Hosea 4–10, zweierlei anonyme Adressaten in Hosea 4–10, Hoffnungsworte nur in Hosea 11, נִאֲמֵי־יְהוָה in Hos 11,11) läßt sich eine literarische Komposition beschreiben, die eine bereits schriftlich abgefasste Gerichtsrede (Hos 4,4 רִיב) um ein Kapitel mit Hoffnungsworten (Hosea 11) erweitert.

Die letzte Zuspitzung der Gerichtsrede in Hos 10,15 läßt sich mit Hos 14,1 vergleichen. Dort gipfelt die Rede von Hos 12,1 – 14,1 in der angekündigten Eroberung Samarias, bevor Hos 14,2–10 von neuer Hoffnung spricht.

Die Gerichtsworte von Hos 12,1 – 14,1 unterscheiden sich von Hosea 4–10 durch die fehlende Verwendung von עֲתֵה und die Anrede nur eines Adressaten, der zwar nach seiner Charakterisierung durch die Hoseaschrift mit der “ihr”-Gruppe von Hosea 4–10 identisch sein könnte, nun aber mit einem kollektiv zu verstehenden “du” angesprochen wird²³. Erneut zeichnet sich eine literarische Komposition ab, die eine schriftlich vorliegende Gerichtsrede (Hos 12,3 רִיב) um ein Kapitel mit Hoffnungsworten (Hos 14,2–10) erweitert. Jedoch spricht Hos 14,3–4 merkwürdigerweise erneut eine kultisch aktive Gruppe mit “ihr” an, während ein “du” in Hos 11,9 am ehesten kollektiv zu deuten ist. So ist strukturell Hosea 11 und 14,2–10 von Hosea 4–10 und 12,1 – 14,1 abzuheben. Gerichts- und Hoffnungsworte wurden sekundär verknüpft. Die in Hos 14,9 erkennbare Interpretation von Hos 4,17 deutet darauf hin, dass die Hoffnungsworte durch einen Akt gelehrter Reflexion den Gerichtsworten angefügt wurden.

Literarkritisch begründen die genannten Merkmale eine Textgliederung, bei der grob sechs Textblöcke unterschieden werden müssen. Hosea 1–2; 3; 4–10; 11; 12,1 – 14,1; 14,2–10. Dabei zeigen sich redaktionelle Bearbeitungen beim Anschluß von Hosea 4 an Hosea 1–3 und von Hosea 12 an Hosea 4–11. In Hos 12,1.3 fallen erkennbar nachträglich eingefügte Bezugnahmen auf Juda auf, die einer “judäischen Redaktion” der Gerichtsreden in Hosea 4–10; 12,1 – 14,1 zuzurechnen sind²⁴. Die Redeeröffnung Hos 4,1–3 hingegen ist von

²³ Direkte Anreden eines kollektiven “du” in Hos 12,7.10; 13,4–5.9–11, vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 119–125.

²⁴ Neben Hos 12,1.3 rechnet z.B. TH. NAUMANN, *Hoseas Erben* (BWANT 131; Stuttgart 1991) 172–176, in Hos 4,5; 5,5; 6,11; 8,14; 10,11 mit einer judäischen Redaktion.

Hos 4,4 – 10,15 abzutrennen und als Überleitungsstück aus Hosea 1–2; 3 zu verstehen. Die Anrede der בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל / “Kinder Israels” findet sich allein in Hos 2,1-2; 3,1.4-5 und 4,1. Auch ist die Ausdrucksweise von Hos 4,3 eng verwandt mit Hos 2,20²⁵. Wie Hos 12,9 und Ps 73,1.13.18 belegen, könnte אֵי / “gewiss” in Hos 4,4 ursprünglich als eine texteröffnende Partikel gebraucht worden sein.

Anders als Hos 1,1 – 4,3 von “Kindern Israels”, “Kindern Judas” und “David” spricht, redet Hos 4,4 – 14,10 nur von “Israel”, “Ephraim”, “Samaria” und “Juda”²⁶. Diese differenzierte, auf abgrenzbare Texte beschränkte Wortwahl halte ich für historisch begründet. Daher erkenne ich redaktionsgeschichtlich dem Spruchgut von Hos 4,4 – 14,10 mit der Erwähnung Samarias und Ephraims einen zeitlichen Vorrang vor den (pseudo?-)biographischen Texten von Hos 1,1 – 4,3 mit einer Erwähnung der “Kinder Israels” und der “Kinder Judas” zu. So geht meine Vorstellung der Textgenese von zwei verwandten gerichtsprophetischen Reden aus, die selbst bereits literarisch gestaltet wurden (Hos 4,4 – 10,15; 12,1 – 14,1)²⁷. Nach oder mit einer Erweiterung durch neuartige Hoffnungsaussagen (Hosea 11; 14,2-10) wurden beide Textblöcke verbunden²⁸. Dabei erhielt die neue Einheit vermutlich ihre “judäische Redaktion”.

²⁵ Ferner ist mit GISIN, *Hosea*, 44-45, auf das Merkmal der Reihung mit אֵי in Hos 3,4 und 4,1 hinzuweisen.

²⁶ Hosea 11 und 14,2-10 haben gar nur “Israel” und “Ephraim” im Blick. In Hos 1,9; 2,1.3 bezieht sich die “ihr”-Anrede nunmehr auf die “Kinder Israel” bzw. “Kinder Juda”, vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 140-144.

²⁷ Diese Bestimmung ist von “kerygmatischen Einheiten”, wie sich H.W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton I. Hosea* (BK.AT XIV/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961) XXIII-XXVII, die erste Verschriftung vorstellte, zu unterscheiden. Der Frage, wie die schriftprophetisch erhebbaren, größeren literarischen Einheiten aus der älteren, mündlichen Verkündigung des Propheten entwickelt wurden, wird in diesem Aufsatz nicht nachgegangen. Trifft etwa der Bezug von Hos 5,8 – 6,6 auf den syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg 734/733 v.Chr. zu (erstmalig A. ALT, “Hosea 5,8 – 6,6. Ein Krieg und seine Folgen in prophetischer Betrachtung”, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* [München 1964] II, 163-187; dem gegenüber kritisch z.B. F.I. ANDERSEN – D.N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* [AB 24; Garden City, NY 1980] 401-405), so verdient der Prozeß von einzelnen prophetischen Worten aus einer längeren Zeitspanne hin zum literarisch verdichteten Text eigene Aufmerksamkeit. Dazu zuletzt J. JEREMIAS, “Das Rätsel der Schriftprophetie”, *ZAW* 125 (2013) 93-117.

²⁸ Entsprechend der verwendeten Anreden könnte Hos 14,2-10 ursprünglich auf Hos 4,4 – 10,15 bezogen gewesen sein, vgl. auch Hos 14,9 und

Hosea 3 setzt erzählerisch Hosea 1 voraus. Hosea 1–2 hat wiederum eine eigene mehrstufige Entwicklung, die mit oder zunächst ohne Hosea 3 dem vorhandenen Text Hosea 4–14 mittels einer generalisierenden Einleitung (Hos 4,1-3) vorangestellt wurde. In ihrer literarischen Gestalt steht Hosea 1–2 nahe zu Hosea 11. Hier wie dort finden sich (möglicherweise alte) gerichtsprophetische Worte, die auf neuartige Hoffnungsworte zulaufen. Wenn noch die „judäische Redaktion“ in Hosea 4–14 israelitische Aussagen additiv auf Juda hin bezieht, so gehen die Hoffnungsworte von Hosea 1–2 schon von einem angestrebten Miteinander von Israeliten und Judäern aus.

So ist das relative Verhältnis größerer Texte zueinander begründet. Darüber hinaus sind kleinere Textänderungen und Einfügungen nicht auszuschließen²⁹. Sie bilden jedoch keine formal beschreibbare, breitere Redaktionsschicht ab. Die historische Einordnung der großen Texteinheiten und -schichten kann nun nur inhaltlich begründet werden. Die relative Textentwicklung legt nahe, Hos 4,4 – 10,15; 12,1 – 14,1 wegen der Aussagen „Israel“, „Ephraim“ und „Samaria“ geschichtlich vor 720 v.Chr. zu verorten³⁰. Für „Juda“-Aussagen trifft dies nur eingeschränkt zu. So gilt Juda in Hos 5,8 – 6,6 als politischer Feind Israels — wahrscheinlich während des syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieges 734/733 v.Chr. und damit vor dem Untergang des Staates Israel. Anders beschreibt die „Juda“ mit Israel gleichsetzende „judäische Redaktion“ eine religiöse Kritik, die mit der Verknüpfung beider Reden durch Hosea 11 und 14 einhergeht. Sie weist in eine neue Phase in der Geschichte Israels. Dies erscheint mit Blick auf Hosea 11 und 14 auch redaktionsgeschichtlich als sinnvoll. Hosea 11 und Hos 14,2-10 setzen die über Israel hereingebrochene nationale Katastrophe der assyrischen Eroberung

4,17. Hosea 11 könnte für die Erweiterung mit Hos 12,1 – 14,1 gebildet worden sein. Zur literarkritischen Zuordnung von Hos 14,10 zu Hos 14,2-10 vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 137-138.

²⁹ So etwa absichtliche Veränderungen der Anrede im masoretischen Text von Hos 2,8.18; 9,10; 10,9, vgl. W. SCHÜTTE, „Eine vormasoretische Textaneignung in der Hoseaschrift?“, *BN* 142 (2009) 33-37, vielleicht die — wie die Doxologien der Amosschrift als später Einschub eingeschätzte — Doxologie von Hos 12,6, vgl. H.-P. MATHYS, *Dichter und Beter* (OBO 132; Freiburg, CH 1994) 105.112, sowie amosische Einfügungen in Hos 4,15; 8,14; 11,10, vgl. JEREMIAS, „Anfänge“, 38-41.

³⁰ Es gibt keine Anzeichen für eine literarische Fiktion oder den metaphorischen Gebrauch dieser Begriffe.

des Landes voraus. Ihre Themen fokussieren allein auf “Israel” und “Ephraim” und deren Zukunft. Schließlich stellen Hosea 1–2; 3 die Israeliten in einen neuen, nach 720 v.Chr. anzusiedelnden Kontext, der eine Verständigung mit den Judäern anstrebt ³¹.

Dieses analytisch gewonnene Bild der Textteile der Hoseaschrift soll in den nächsten Kapiteln in seiner möglichen Entwicklung synthetisch beschrieben werden. Die Zielsetzung jeder literarischen Einheit wird dargestellt. Dabei werde ich, wie bereits gesagt, besonders den Gebrauch der Wurzel שׁוּב / “sich wenden” hervorheben.

III. Die Entfremdung

Die Gerichtsrede von Hos 4,4 – 10,15 beschreibt aus Sicht ihres Verfassers, wie die Beziehung von Israel und seinem Gott auseinanderreißt. Sie sieht in den wirtschaftlichen Erfolgen der Großkaufmannsschicht von Ephraim nur Scheinblüten (Hos 7,8–11.14), die neben innenpolitischen Intrigen (Hos 7,1–7 ³²) zu einer verlogenen protzigen Religionsausübung führen (vgl. Hosea 8; 10,1–2) ³³. Die Menschen verfehlen Gott in ihrer Anbetung, weil sie sich Gott entsprechend ihrer eigenen Handlungsweisen vorstellen: “Wir haben dich erkannt” (Hos 8,2). Was aber haben die Menschen, die Gott immer wieder suchten (vgl. Hos 5,6; 6,1), von ihm erkannt?

Vorab erscheint mir eine kleine Anmerkung vonnöten. Hos 4,4 – 10,15 ist eine kämpferische Streitrede, die sich an theologisch

³¹ Mit dieser Frühdatierung aller größeren Texteinheiten der Hoseaschrift in das ausgehende 8. Jh. bis beginnende 7. Jh. v.Chr. unterbreite ich forschungsgeschichtlich einen neuen Vorschlag zur Datierung, insbesondere mit der Annahme einer die Hoseaschrift abschließenden, *israelitischen* Textproduktion im jüdischen Exil nach 720 v.Chr., vgl. B.E. KELLE, “Hosea 1–3 in Twentieth-Century Scholarship”, *CuBR* 7 (2009) 179–216; Id., “Hosea 4–14 in Twentieth-Century Scholarship”, *CuBR* 8 (2010) 314–375.

³² Neben Hos 13,10 ist Hos 7,5–7 das einzige Wort der Hoseaschrift zur instabilen Monarchie Israels. Wie auch das mögliche Wort aus der Zeit des syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieges (Hos 5,8 – 6,6) werden die politischen Ereignisse jener Zeit immer mit einem Fehlverhalten der Oberschicht oder einer falschen Toleranz der Religionsbediensteten (Hos 13,10) begründet.

³³ Diese Oberschicht in Israel bezeichnet die Hoseaschrift mit “Ephraim”, vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 29–67, zum hos. Bild dieser Großkaufmannsschicht im 8. Jh. v.Chr. insbesondere 60–67.

denkende Adressaten richtet. So ist das Bild, mit dem die Hoseaschrift die religiöse Situation im Land wiedergibt, religionsgeschichtlich eine tendenziöse Zeichnung. Ihre Zustandsbeschreibung ist *eine* Interpretation der erlebten Zeit. Was für sie Realität "ist", war für Zeitgenossen — und ist heute für Archäologen — durchaus strittig³⁴. Erst der Fortgang der Geschichte wird die Sicht von Hos 4,4 – 10,15 rechtfertigen, als sie ermöglicht, neue Ereignisse in religiöse Erfahrungen zu integrieren und ältere Einstellungen, die sich als ungeeignet erwiesen, zu korrigieren. So reift theologische Erkenntnis mit der und durch die Zeit. Die tendenziöse Darstellung der Hoseaschrift ist bei der folgenden Nachzeichnung ihrer Gedanken zu berücksichtigen.

Hos 4,4 – 10,15 bestreitet den Anspruch eines neuen ökonomischen Denkens, das mit quasi göttlichem Machtanspruch das traditionelle Verständnis von Israels Gottesbeziehung trübt. Die schriftprophetische Rede polemisiert gegen ein von ökonomischen Erfolgen geprägtes Gottesverständnis und ein Selbstverständnis führender Kreise in Israel, das von dem Machbaren geleitet wird³⁵. In diesem neuen Denken bestimmt der Warenaustausch, das wechselseitige Geben und Nehmen, die Beziehung (Hos 10,1). Gesellschaftlich erlaubt ist, was erfolgreich ist. Indem man auch von Israels Gott Erfolg erwartet und seinen Kult am Erfolg partizipieren lässt, verkehrt Israel unter der Hand JHWH zu einem "Baal". Diese erst auf den zweiten Blick erkennbare Verfehlung des wahren Gottes Israels durch seine vornehmsten Anbetenden erschwerte die prophetische Argumentation. Nicht eine leicht benennbare göttliche Konkurrenz, sondern eine durch das althergebrachte Verständnis nicht mehr gedeckte, neue Gestaltung der Gottesbeziehung erschütterte Theologen des JHWH-Kultes und provozierte die schriftprophetische Rede³⁶.

Die Schriftprophetenworte streichen heraus, dass Menschen dem ethischen Anspruch Gottes in einer sehr veränderten Zeit nicht wirklich gerecht werden. Es fehlt den direkt Angesprochenen und auch anderen im Volk eine wirkliche Gotteserkenntnis (דעת אלהים), um

³⁴ Eine Skizze der gesellschaftlichen und wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung Israels und Judas vom 10.-8. Jh. v.Chr. bietet S.-H. HONG, *The Metaphor of Illness and Healing in Hosea and Its Significance in the Socio-Economic Context of Eighth-Century Israel and Judah* (SBL 95; New York 2006) 91-128.

³⁵ Vgl. auch HONG, *Metaphor*, 148.151-152.

³⁶ Zur hos. Kritik des religiösen Verantwortungsbewußtseins vgl. F. CRÜSEMANN, "Hosea und die Entstehung des biblischen Geschichtsbildes", *Kanon und Sozialgeschichte* (Gütersloh 2003) 127-128.

die Gottesbeziehung in Treue (חסד) und Gerechtigkeit (צדקה) zu leben (Hos 4,6; 5,4; 6,6; 10,12)³⁷. Diese fundamentale Störung der Beziehung versperrt jede Hinkehr zu Gott, auch wenn sie vielfältig gesucht wird (Hos 5,4 שׁוּב). Der praktizierte Gottesdienst wird als ein falscher, wirklich “hurerischer” Gottesdienst beschrieben, der sich trotz Anrufung des Gottesnamens in Wahrheit zum “Nicht-Hohen”, dem Götzen, kehrt (Hos 7,16 שׁוּב)³⁸. Dies nicht zu erkennen, gilt als ein falscher Stolz (גאון), der es Menschen verwehrt zu Gott zurückzukehren (Hos 7,10 שׁוּב vgl. 5,5). Während die Einen kurzfristige Erfolge mit einem Gottesdienst feiern (Hos 10,1) und die Anderen Mißerfolge mit religiösen Bußaktionen wenden wollen (Hos 6,1-3 שׁוּב), sieht die Gerichtsrede, dass Gott — anders als Israel selbst — sein Volk genau erkannt hat (Hos 5,3), sich darum in dieser Zeit von seinem Volk abwendet und es seinem Tun preisgibt (Hos 4,9 שׁוּב). Sie beschreibt Gottes Abwenden mit gewagten, ungewöhnlichen Metaphern als schädigendes Tun an seinem Volk (Hos 5,12.14)³⁹. Damit fordern die schriftprophetischen Worte Gottes- und Weltdeutungen ihrer Zeit heraus.

Das Ringen um Gotteserkenntnis und Selbsterkenntnis findet im 1. Gebot des Dekalogs eine gewichtige biblische Antwort. Dieses religiöse Grundbekenntnis zu Gott als dem Befreier aus Versklavung bringen auch Hos 8,13; 9,3 kritisch in Anschlag. Die Mißachtung des 1. Gebotes muss zur Aufhebung des Aktes führen, der die Beziehung zwischen Gott und Israel anfänglich begründete: “Israel wird nach Ägypten zurückkehren” (שׁוּב)⁴⁰. Mit dieser theologisch herausfor-

³⁷ Vgl. H.W. WOLFF, “‘Wissen um Gott’ bei Hosea als Urform von Theologie”, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 22; München 1973) 182-205, und zu Wolff mit notwendigen Korrekturen R.G. KRATZ, “Erkenntnis Gottes im Hoseabuch”, *Prophetenstudien* (FAT 74; Tübingen 2011) 287-309.

³⁸ Zur theologischen Metapher der “Hurerei” vgl. A.A. KEEFE, *Woman’s Body and the Social Body in Hosea* (JSOTSS 338; London 2001).

³⁹ Vgl. B. SEIFFERT, *Metaphorisches Reden von Gott im Hoseabuch* (FRLANT 166; Göttingen 1996).

⁴⁰ Möglicherweise gründeten solche Äußerungen in Hos 4,4 – 10,15 ursprünglich in profanen Überlegungen auf der Grundlage des Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhangs, vgl. KRATZ, “Erkenntnis”, 300-301, und Hos 7,16; 9,6. Wenn jedoch Hos 12,10; 13,4 redaktionsgeschichtlich auf gleicher Ebene wie Hos 8,13; 9,3 anzusiedeln sind, bestand bereits zur Zeit der beiden ältesten Textüberlieferungen der Hoseaschrift eine Exodustheologie. Allerdings “ist es methodisch entscheidend, nicht das Geschichtsbild des kanonischen Alten Testaments als vorgegebenen Bezugsrahmen in Rechnung zu stellen” (CRÜSEMANN, “Hosea”, 125).

dernden Behauptung verdeutlicht die Gerichtsrede das völlige Sich-entfremden von Mensch und Gott zu ihrer Zeit. Zur Gottvergessenheit der Menschen wird die Abwesenheit Gottes treten (Hos 5,15 שׁוּב). Die prophetische Rede erschöpft sich jedoch nicht allein darin anzuprangern, wie sich die Beziehung von Gott und Mensch auflöst. Als Rede, die sich von Gott beauftragt weiß, mündet ihre Argumentation in das Werben um eine erneuerte Beziehung zu Gott; sie schließt mit der Mahnung “es ist Zeit, JHWH zu suchen, bis er kommt, um צֶדֶק / “das Rechte” auf euch regnen zu lassen” (Hos 10,12)⁴¹. Wenn dann abschließend den Adressaten nochmals Wirkungen ihres Versagens vor Augen gestellt werden, so bestimmt der Gesamttext die zeitgeschichtliche Stunde als “fünf vor zwölf”.

Eine Zukunftshoffnung für Israel wird in dieser Zeit einer gegenseitigen Entfremdung von Gott und Menschen allein in Hos 6,11 – 7,1 laut. Beide Verse werfen zwischen lauter Anklagen einen kurzen Blick in eine neue Zeit und erhoffen von Gott eine Bekehrung Israels zur Erkenntnis dessen, was es tut: wenn Gott Israel heilt, wird alle seine Schuld offenbar sein (Hos 7,1). Die heilsame Zukunft Gottes schließt ein, dass Unrecht und Schuld benennbar wird. Die Gerichtsrede vermag nicht mehr zu hoffen, als dass ein neuer Anfang die unheilige Vergangenheit nicht verschweigen muss. Wo Schuld offen als Schuld benannt werden kann, da sind Menschen von ihrem Tun abgekehrt, und sie beginnen eine neue Zeit mit ihrem Gott.

Wenn Hos 6,11a.b die “Wende des Geschicks meines Volkes” (שׁוּבִי שְׁבוּת עַמִּי) mit einer “Ernte für Juda” verbindet, so bestehen Zweifel, ob diese Aussage zur ursprünglichen Fassung von Hos 4,4 – 10,15 gehörte⁴². Die Wendung “auch Juda” (גַּם־יְהוּדָה) zeigt eine typische Formulierung der “judäischen Redaktion” (vgl. Hos 5,5). Der Ausdruck “mein Volk” (עַמִּי), bezogen auf dessen Gesamtheit, verweist bereits auf die juda-exilische Zeit von Hosea 1–2⁴³.

⁴¹ Es ist für die Hoseaschrift charakteristisch, dass Gottesrede und Schriftprophetenrede oft ineinander fließen. So verschmilzt in ihrer literarischen Überlieferung Gottes- und Menschenwort.

⁴² NAUMANN, *Erben*, 50-58.

⁴³ Als Bezeichnung des verführten Volkes: Hos 4,6.8.12; 11,7, insbesondere des bedrückten Volkes: Mi 2,4.8.9; 3,3.5. Als Bezeichnung des Volkes in seiner Gesamtheit: Hos 1,9; 2,1.3.25; Am 7,8.15; 8,2; 9,10.14; Mi 1,9; 6,3.5.16. עַמִּי ist stets ein Ehrentitel für Israel.

Die auffällige Wendung **שוב שבות** ist außerbiblisch bereits für das 8. Jh. v.Chr. belegt, doch weist Am 9,14 ihren Gebrauch ebenfalls eher der nachstaatlichen Zeit Israels zu ⁴⁴.

IV. Die zerstörte Beziehung

Die Gerichtsprophetie von Hos 12,1 – 14,1 setzt gedanklich bereits die zerstörte Gottesbeziehung voraus, wenn sie in Hos 12,3.15 mit **שוב** allein den Gedanken aufgreift, Gott zahle Israel nach seinen Taten heim. Tatsächlich zeichnet die gesamte Rede eine für ihre Adressaten völlig verfahrenene Situation, die nun nicht nur für den König (Hos 10,15), sondern mit Samaria für ganz Israel Zerstörung und Tod bereit hält (Hos 14,1) ⁴⁵.

Einen anderen Aspekt deutet einzig die hos. Paraphrase der Jabbokgeschichte (Hos 12,4-5) an. Genau genommen wird in Hos 12,4-5.7a der Verweis auf die Jabbokerzählung (Genesis 32) von Hinweisen auf Jakobs Geburtsgeschichte (Gen 25,22) und seinen Traum zu Bethel (Gen 28,11-22 vgl. 35,6-15) umfasst ⁴⁶. Hos 12,7b schließt die Jakobsnotizen mit der Mahnung ab, Recht (**משפט**) und Treue (**חסד**) zu bewahren. Diese Zuspitzung ähnelt der adressatenbezogenen Mahnung von Hos 10,12, Gerechtigkeit (**צדקה**) zu säen, um Treue (**חסד**) zu ernten. Formulierte Hos 10,12 damit die positive Zielaussage am Ende der ersten Rede, so steht mit Hos 12,7 die Mahnung jedoch bereits am Anfang der zweiten Rede. Sie wirbt mit Hilfe der knapp und für Jakob unvoreteilhaft skizzierten Vätergeschichte für eine mögliche Wende. Ihr wird angesichts der anschließend beschriebenen Entfremdung von Gott und Israel in den Bereichen der Wirtschaft, der

⁴⁴ Zur Diskussion der aramäischen Belege von Sefire vgl. M. BEN-YASHAR – M. ZIPOR, Art. **שוב / שבות**, *TWAT* VII, 965 mit der in 960 eingefügten Note von H.-J. FABRY. Zu Am 9,14 vgl. SCHÜTTE, "Amosschrift", 539-540.

⁴⁵ Darf man aus dem Umstand, dass diese Streitrede anders als Hos 4,4 – 10,15 nicht mehr zugleich an die führende Person im Adressatenkreis gerichtet ist, schließen, dass diese Führung nunmehr weggebrochen war? Oder sollte sie umgangen werden?

⁴⁶ Die Komposition von Hos 12,4-5.7a unterstreicht, wie die Hoseaschrift in unkanonischer Weise frei und vielleicht erstmals Erzählzusammenhänge konstruiert. Dabei liegt, wie CRÜSEMANN, "Hosea", feststellt, der schriftprophetische Fokus auf einer Darstellung des schuldhaften menschlichen Verhaltens.

Politik, des Glaubens und der sozialen Ordnung vom Autor keine wirkliche Chance eingeräumt. Noch grimmigere Tiermetaphern (Hos 13,7-8 vgl. Hos 5,12.14) unterstreichen, dass aus schriftprophetischer Sicht Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis rar geworden ist.

Einzig Hos 12,7a eröffnet mit der alten Zusage an Jakob „du wirst mit deinem Gott heimkehren“ (שוב, vgl. Gen 28,15) eine Hoffnung. Damit geht der Mahnung die Erwartung voraus, dass ein versöhntes Gottesverhältnis grundsätzlich noch möglich ist. Aber sogleich folgt Ephraims Erklärung, dass es sich keines schuldhaften Frevels bewusst sei (Hos 12,9). Literarisch ist in Hos 12,7 jedoch weder Jakob noch Ephraim, sondern — im Anschluß an eine Doxologie (Hos 12,6) — auf der Metaebene des Textes der Adressat der Gerichtsrede angesprochen. Hos 12,10 verdeutlicht, dass mit „du“ in V. 7 kollektiv eine Gemeinschaft angeredet ist. Schloß Hos 12,5b mit „dort redet er mit uns“, so appelliert der Autor in erkennbarer Verbundenheit an diese Gruppe⁴⁷. Auf diese Weise werden die Jakobsgeschichten rhetorisch einer Adressatengruppe zur Identifikation angeboten, um ihnen neue geistliche Erkenntnis zu erschließen.

Die Aktualisierung der Jakobsgeschichten und die ergänzende Mahnung durch Hos 12,5b.7b legen die Möglichkeit nahe, dass sich die Adressaten, wie einst Jakob, in einer Fremde befanden und, wie auch Jakob selbst (Hos 12,5b = Gen 35,7.9-15), nach Bethel zurückkehren könnten. Doxologie und die direkte Anrede „du“ (im Stil der anonymen Anrede innerhalb der zweiten Gerichtsrede) von Hos 12,6-7 wären dann als Ausdruck einer Heimkehrhoffnung aus einem anderen Land zu verstehen. Eine solche reale Flucht- oder Exilsituation war historisch für Israeliten nach 720 und nach 586 v.Chr. gegeben.

Die exegetische Anfrage an Hos 12,5, ob die Fassung des masoretischen Textes den ältesten Textbestand repräsentiert, bleibt bestehen⁴⁸. Wie bereits bei Hos 6,11 zu überlegen war, ist auch bei

⁴⁷ Die Vermutung von J. ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetae* (Septuaginta XIII; Göttingen 1943) 129-130, statt עָמִי sei ein עַמִּי ursprünglicher, ist für die Gottesrede des MT nicht zwingend. Für Hos 12,5 LXX repräsentiert Jakob bereits das Volk Israel (vgl. Hos 11,1 LXX). Daher wird Jakobs Handeln in der 3. Pers. Pl. formuliert. Nach der von MT abweichenden passivischen Wendung der LXX („dort wurde zu ihm gesprochen“) sollte daher in V. 7 das Volk zu Gott (πρὸς αὐτόν) gesprochen haben.

⁴⁸ J. JEREMIAS, *Der Prophet Amos* (ATD 24,1; Göttingen 1983) 148 Anm. 6, votiert mit ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetae*, für die Ursprünglichkeit der LXX.

Hos 12,5 ein späterer, frühestens auf der Redaktionsebene von Hosea 11 erfolgter Eingriff in die Textgestaltung nicht auszuschließen. Dies gilt insbesondere dann, wenn die zweite Gerichtsrede den Untergang Samarias (Hos 14,1) noch erwartet. Möglicherweise wurde die ganze Einheit Hos 12,1 – 14,1 auch verfasst, als die assyrische Invasion bereits erfolgt und der Verlust der nationalen Eigenständigkeit unabweislich war. Auf jeden Fall aber lag sie der „judäischen Redaktion“ zur Bearbeitung vor. Tatsächlich begründen erst Hosea 11 und 14 in einer deutlich veränderten Situation eine neue Hoffnung für Israel.

V. Gottes Zuwendung

Hosea 11 hebt sich deutlich von der vorhergehenden Gerichtsprophetie ab, wenn auch die ersten Verse dieses Kapitels Gerichtsworte formulieren. Wie R. Vielhauer gezeigt hat, dient eine gerichtsprphetische Überlieferung in V. 1-6 dazu, in V. 7-11 vermittels wieder aufgenommener Begriffe eine Hoffnungsperspektive aufzubauen⁴⁹. Schuld und Versagen Israels gipfeln V. 5 in der Ankündigung: „Nicht kehrt es zurück zum Land Ägypten, aber Assur, er ist sein König“. Damit greift Hos 11,5, allerdings negiert, einen schon Hos 8,13; 9,3 geäußerten Gedanken auf. Das „nicht ... aber“ kann metaphorisch die assyrische Besetzung des Landes seit 720 v.Chr. als „Leben in Ägypten“ interpretieren⁵⁰. Vielleicht liegt im MT auch eine schlichte Verschreibung von לֹא („nicht“) aus ursprünglichem לוֹ („ihm“) vor, das zum vorhergehenden Satz gehörte⁵¹. Dann hieße es sinnleich

⁴⁹ Neben מַעֲרִים Hos 11,1.5.11; קָרָא Hos 11,1.2.7; יִשְׂרָאֵל Hos 11,1.8; בֶּן Hos 11,1.10; אֲפָרִים Hos 11,3.8.9; רוֹם Hos 11,4.7; אֲשׁוּר Hos 11,5.11; שׂוֹיֵב Hos 11,5.(7).9; עִיר Hos 11,6.9 kennzeichnet nach R. VIELHAUER, *Das Werden des Buches Hosea* (BZAW 349; Berlin 2007) 24, auch בַּעַל / עַל Hos 11,2.7 die wortstatistische Trennlinie zwischen V. 6 und V. 7. Die Gerichtsworte können darauf hindeuten, dass den Tradenten über die Gerichtsreden Hos 4,4 – 10,15; 12,1 – 14,1 hinaus noch weitere hos. Tradition bekannt war.

⁵⁰ W. Gisin verdanke ich den Hinweis, mit „Assur“ sei hier (und erneut in Hos 14,4!) der Gott Assyriens gemeint, der anstelle von JHWH Israels König werde.

⁵¹ LXX liest αὐτῷ (לוֹ ?) als Objekt zum vorausgehenden Satz. Doch ist nicht zwingend eine Verschreibung in MT anzunehmen. Obwohl Hosea 11 LXX den ihr zugrundeliegenden hebräischen Text deutlich erkennen läßt, erzielt LXX durch kleinste Veränderungen ein neues Szenario, das die ägyptische Diaspora zur Heimkehr nach Juda aufruft.

“Es kehrt zurück zum Land Ägypten, und Assur, er ist sein König”. Ebenso könnte die Negation in einem bekräftigenden Sinn (“wirklich”) gebraucht sein⁵². Für die Zeit der assyrischen Eroberung Ägyptens unter Assarhaddon und Assurbanipal (ca. 669-652 v.Chr.) ergäbe MT (“wirklich, es kehrt zurück ... und Assur ...”) dann ebenfalls eine politische stimmige Aussage.

Der erneuten Negation aller Hoffnung auf ein sich änderndes Israel (Hos 11,1-6) korrespondiert eine deutliche Negierung der Negation Israels durch Gott in Hos 11,9: “nicht vollstrecke ich meinen glühenden Zorn, nicht kehre ich um, Ephraim zu verderben”. Gott kehrt aus seiner Abwendung von Israel um (vgl. Hos 5,15 שׁוּב), um zu retten. Er betont seine Gottheit “... und bin kein Mensch” (Hos 11,9). Gott selbst erneuert seine Beziehung zu Israel und ermöglicht damit eine neue Begegnung Israels mit seinem Gott.

Mit eruptiver Emotion artikuliert Hos 11,8-9 die unerklärliche Wende, mit der Gott aus sich heraus einen Neuanfang setzt. Sie zeigt sich für Menschen als ein gewaltiges Ringen Gottes mit sich selbst, bei dem Gottes Treue über seinen Zorn die Oberhand behält. Die Dramatik geht um so tiefer, als textlich bei der Wende zur Erneuerung der Beziehung mit V. 7 erneut die beharrliche Abkehrung Israels von seinem Gott betont wird. Israel bleibt in seiner Verkehrung. Israels Weigerung, seinen wahren Gott zu erkennen, und sein Verlangen, trotz allen Unheils dem vermeintlich Hohen nachzustreben, versetzt es in einen freischwebenden Zustand: “aber mein Volk – sie hängen in Abtrünnigkeit (מְשׁוּבָה) von mir” (Hos 11,7). Was die schriftprophetische Rede als Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis beschreibt, wurde nur von Gott selbst und wenigen Menschen wie dem Urheber von Hosea 11 erkannt. Gottes neuschöpferischem Akt geht weder eine neue Einsicht Israels in Gottes Handeln noch eine weiterschreitende Selbsterkenntnis voraus. Die Mahnung von Hos 10,12 (vgl. Hos 12,7) hatte keinen Widerhall gefunden. Israel selbst blieb mehrheitlich in seiner früheren Geisteshaltung. Hosea 11 beschreibt damit theologisch eine historische Situation, die sich von jeder Exilskonzeption nach 586 v.Chr. deutlich unterscheidet⁵³: eine Wende bahnt sich trotz der Gottesblindheit Israels an.

⁵² Z.B. F.I. ANDERSEN – D.N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea*, 583-584.

⁵³ Zu Jeremia 39-43, 2 Könige und 2 Chronik vgl. R. ALBERTZ, *Die Exilszeit* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 7; Stuttgart 2001) 13-22.

In der größten Entfremdung eröffnet Hosea 11 ein Angebot Gottes, das die Beziehung zu seinem Volk erneuert. Diese im letzten nicht aufgebende Hinwendung Gottes zu den Menschen ermöglicht menschliche Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis aus dem Akt der Selbstoffenbarung Gottes heraus. Sie begründet den Vorrang der Gottesvor der Selbsterkenntnis nicht aus dem Rangunterschied zwischen Gott und Mensch, sondern aus dem Vermögen Gottes, sich selbst Menschen zu enthüllen, und so den Prozess der doppelten Erkenntnis überhaupt (neu) initiieren zu können.

Der Kapitelschluß Hos 11,10-11 schaut auf ein nach Ägypten und Assur zerstreutes Volk und erhofft dessen Heimführung durch Gott. Er setzt voraus, dass die Hos 11,5-6 angekündigte Katastrophe eingetreten ist. Nun befanden sich offenbar israelitische Mitmenschen des Verfassers von Hosea 11 in nennenswerter Zahl in Assyrien und Ägypten. Der Verfasser selbst aber lebte entweder noch im Land Israel oder — eher — im Nachbarland Juda. Die „judäische Redaktion“ in Hos 4,4 – 10,15; 12,1 – 14,1 erfolgte wohl, als Hosea 11 in den Text eingefügt wurde. Daher ist Juda nach 720 v.Chr. als Ursprungsregion des Textes zu vermuten⁵⁴. Die „judäische“ Redaktion sollte folglich präziser als „juda-exilische“ Redaktion israelitischer Tradenten der hos. Gerichtsreden bestimmt werden.

VI. Einladung zur Hoffnung

Hos 14,2-10 setzt die gleiche historische Situation wie Hosea 11 voraus. Der erwartete Fall Samarias hat auch Israel zu Fall gebracht. Die Überlebenden der Katastrophe fühlen sich verwaist; antiassyrische Affekte werden herausgestellt (Hos 14,4). Für ganz Israel ist eine Exilsituation vorausgesetzt (Hos 14,8 שׁוֹיב) ⁵⁵. Die Rede lädt adressatenspezifisch einen bestimmten Kreis in Israel zur neuen

⁵⁴ Zu diesem Schluss kommen auch grundsätzliche Überlegungen zum Ursprung der Gerichtsprophetie von R.G. KRATZ, „Die Redaktion der Prophetenbücher“, *Prophetenstudien* (FAT 74; Tübingen 2011) 42-44.

⁵⁵ Obwohl das Heimatland Israel als historischer Ort nicht völlig auszuschließen ist (vgl. die grundsätzlichen Überlegungen von A. BERLEJUNG, „Tempelkult in Nachkriegszeiten“, *Kein Land für sich allein. Festschrift für M. Weippert* [eds. U. HÜBNER – E.A. KNAUF] [Freiburg 2002] 196-230), weisen die antiassyrische Haltung von Hosea 14 und die juda-exilische Redaktion in Hosea 4-14 auf Juda hin.

Gotteserkenntnis und einem persönlichen Schuldeingeständnis ein (Hos 14,2-3 שׁוּב). Sie begründet diese Einladung mit einer "Selbstreflexion Gottes", die seine bedingungslos vorlaufende Gnade entfaltet. Hos 14,5-7 beschreibt eine Selbstoffenbarung Gottes, die sich nicht im Dialog mit der Gruppe, sondern scheinbar noch in der Zurückgezogenheit Gottes vollzieht. Sie will erahnt werden. Entsprechend der Sprechaktgestaltung des Textes können die Adressaten von Hos 14,2-10 Gottes Entscheidung wie durch eine unsichtbare Wand ertauschen⁵⁶. Der Autor des Schlußkapitels nimmt Gottes Gedanken auf. Er, ein Tradent der ältesten Gerichtsrede (Hos 14,9; vgl. 4,17), antwortet in Hos 14,8-10 autoritativ auf diese neue Offenbarung des unergründlich gnädigen Gottes nach der tiefsten Entfremdung von Gott und seinem Volk mit seiner neu gewonnenen Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis. Damit wirbt der Schluss um die Zustimmung der Menschen, die anfangs zur Umkehr aufgerufen wurden.

Wenn auch Hos 14,2-10 bestimmte Adressaten umwirbt, zur Erkenntnis und Verehrung des wahren Gottes zu kommen, so bleibt Israel insgesamt in der Wahrnehmung Gottes resistent gegen jede neue Erkenntnis. Noch immer bestimmt "Abtrünnigkeit" (Hos 14,5 מְשׁוּבָה vgl. 11,7) das Verhalten des Volkes. Die Geisteshaltung der Israeliten hat sich trotz des Verlustes der Heimat und ihres Exils in Juda nicht geändert. Die judäischen Verhältnisse scheinen sich — nach Ausweis der "juda-exilischen Redaktion" — auch nicht entscheidend von den heimatlichen religiösen Gebräuchen Israels unterschieden zu haben⁵⁷. Zeigt sich Gott dessen ungeachtet bereit, von seinem Zorn zu lassen (Hos 14,5 שׁוּב vgl. Hos 11,9), so wirbt Hos 4,4 – 14,10 als Gesamttext darum, dass sich seine Zielgruppe durch die Erkenntnis des heilsamen Gottes als Speerspitze der religiösen Neubesinnung gewinnen läßt.

VII. Die pädagogische Vermittlung I

Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis in Hosea 1–2 wird in einem biographisch gestalteten Rahmen entfaltet. Sein Anhalt am historischen Hosea läßt sich nicht mehr überprüfen. Die vorliegende Textgestalt zeigt ein Textwachstum in Hosea 1. Die ursprüngliche

⁵⁶ SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 135-140.

⁵⁷ S.a. Am 2,4-5; dazu SCHÜTTE, "Völkersprüche", 544-545.

Verwerfung von Königtum, Führungsschicht und den ersten Adressaten der beiden alten Gerichtsreden, die erzählerisch in die Namensgebung der drei Kinder Hoseas gekleidet war, wurde um Zusagen erweitert, die zwar das Ende von Israels Königtum bekräftigen, aber der israelitischen Gemeinschaft (בית ישראל) und den ersten Adressaten des Textes Hoffnung in Juda und mit dessen Führung verheißen. Beurteilte die „juda-exilische Redaktion“ in Hosea 4–14 die religiösen Verhältnisse in Juda sehr kritisch, so ist diese Einstellung nun um ein konstruktives Zugehen auf die jüdische Politik ergänzt worden. Eine religiöse Versöhnung und politische Vereinigung wird vorstellbar (Hos 2,1-3) ⁵⁸.

Redaktionsgeschichtlich bildet Hos 2,2-3 vielleicht eine zweite Bearbeitung ⁵⁹, sicher jedoch eine Überleitung von der neuen Zukunftsperspektive in Hos 1,5.6bβ-7; 2,1 zur Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Hos 2,4-25. Wie in Hos 4,1.4; 12,3 wird in Hos 2,4 die nachfolgende Rede als „Streit“ (ריב) vorgestellt. Obwohl zunächst Hoseas Kinder direkt angesprochen sind, ihre Mutter wegen deren Vorgeschichte zu verklagen, folgt eine Gottesrede, in der über Mutter und Kinder gesprochen wird. Erst in Hos 2,18-22 wird die Mutter (Israel) direkt angesprochen. Danach wird erneut an die Namen der Kinder angeknüpft. Motivische Verbindungen zu Hos 4,1-3 und zu den Kindern aus Hosea 1 begründen Hos 2,18-22.23-25 als redaktionelle Ergänzungen zur literarischen Verknüpfung mit dem weiteren Textumfeld.

Die Geschichte der Mutter Israel wird in Hos 2,4-17 zunächst als Entfremdung beschrieben. Ihre Orientierung an den „Liebhabern“ mit ihren Gaben (Hos 2,7) wurde jedoch von Israels Gott durch einen „Sperrwall“ (Hos 2,8) massiv unterbunden, so dass sich Israel pragmatisch wieder für seinen Gott entschied (Hos 2,9 שוב). Diese oberflächliche Rückbesinnung erreicht nicht die nötige Tiefe, die eine nachdenkende Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis anstrebt. Sie hat sich nur wenig von der früheren, als „Abtrünnigkeit“ (משובה) bezeichneten Grundhaltung Israels entfernt. Den erwünschten Prozess fördert nun Gott selbst, indem er die Not Israels verstärkt. Israel verliert nicht nur den Zugang zu seinen Kulturgütern, sondern wird in die Wüste geführt. Dort soll sich in neuerlicher Begegnung die alte Beziehung zwischen Gott und Israel

⁵⁸ Zu Hos 1,2 – 2,3 vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 140-144, 171-175 und DERS., „Juda“, 63-70.

⁵⁹ Vgl. G.A. YEE, *Composition*, 68-72.

erneuern. Mit dieser Vorstellung greift der Text gezielt auf das alte Exodusmotiv zurück (Hos 2,17), das schon früher in Umkehrung seiner eigentlichen Aussage verwendet wurde. Nun gewinnt es die ursprüngliche, verheißungsvolle Bedeutung in einer gewandelten historischen Situation, dem israelitischen Exil in Juda, zurück.

Die Gottesrede formuliert Israels Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis nicht als göttlichen Zwangsakt. Vielmehr wird Israel von Gott verführt (פִּתּוּיָהּ), mit ihm in die Wüste zu gehen; dort will er wie ein Liebhaber Israel zu Herzen reden (עַל-לֵב), sie beschenken und so bereit machen, seinem Werben zu antworten (עֲנֵה). Hos 2,16-17 schreibt der erneuten Gotteserkenntnis einen innewohnenden Eros zu, der aus sich heraus eine gewinnende Dynamik entfaltet, welche die äußerlich Israel bedrängende Situation der "Wüste" umzuwerten vermag.

Wie die vorangegangenen Textstücke spricht auch Hos 2,4-25 von keiner wirklichen Umkehrbereitschaft Israels. Die Tradenten des prophetischen Wortes entfalten allein die erstaunliche göttliche Entwicklung, der Gottvergessenheit Israels aufzuhelfen. Sie entwickeln ein pädagogisches Programm Gottes auf der Basis einer (re-)konstruierten Heilsgeschichte. Neue geschichtliche Erfahrung wird gedeutet als Ermöglichung neu-alter Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis. In dieser Phase theologischer Reflexion konnten die Tradenten vermutlich auf die in Hos 14,9-10 artikuliert Erkenntnis zurückgreifen und deren Ansatz vertiefen.

Das pädagogische Programm Gottes von Hos 2,4-25 dürfte in seinem Selbstverständnis die Logik von Theologen spiegeln, die einen tief reflektierten Glauben lebten. Ihre aktive Geschichtsdeutung ⁶⁰, verbunden mit einem programmatischen Anspruch auf Glaubensreflexion in Israel, kann nicht als niederschwellig bezeichnet werden. So ist es zu bezweifeln, dass die Hoseaschrift in diesem Stadium im Volk verbreitet war ⁶¹.

⁶⁰ Vgl. CRÜSEMANN, "Hosea".

⁶¹ Siehe auch R.G. KRATZ, "Die Worte des Amos von Tekoa", *Prophetenstudien* (FAT 74; Tübingen 2011) 341-342. Die breite pädagogische Vermittlung der hos. juda-exilischen Theologie kommt vermutlich erst mit Durchsetzung der jüngeren, pädagogisch angelegten dtn-dtr. Theologie (z.B. Dtn 6,4-5.6-9).

VIII. Die pädagogische Vermittlung II

Hosea 3 setzt voraus, dass die Zeit des Exils für Israel lange andauern wird. Berücksichtigt man die Projektion der Aussage in die längst vergangene Zeit des Propheten, so rechtfertigt die Erzählung offenkundig eine lange Exilszeit, in der Israel sich besinnen muss – separiert von allem heimatlich Vertrauten. “Umkehr” wird theologisch in neuer Weise als eine Bewegung gefasst, die Israel zukünftig vollzieht⁶². Die Gerichtsankündigung wird auf dem bereits in Hosea 2 eingeschlagenen Weg pädagogisiert und auf zwei zu erreichende Ziele fixiert: Israels Hinwendung zu seinem Gott — und zu dem Judäer David als seinem König (Hos 3,5 שׁוּב).

Die angestrebte Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis ist auch nach “vielen Tagen” (Hos 3,4) nicht erreicht worden. Die Tradenten der Hoseaschrift haben in Juda jedoch zwischenzeitlich eine weitere Annäherung an das davidische Königshaus vollzogen (vgl. Hos 2,2)⁶³. Eine Verbindung beider Interessen erschien für sie erfolgversprechend. Es lässt sich nicht nachweisen, ob diese Einschätzung zutreffend war. Dafür spricht jedoch, dass die Hoseaschrift in den biblischen Kanon aufgenommen wurde. Dies impliziert ihre Rezeption und allgemeine Anerkennung. Tatsächlich bildet Hosea den Auftakt der Sammlung der Zwölf-Propheten-Schriften. Damit darf eine grundlegende Bedeutung von Hosea für die Traditionsbildung angenommen werden. Schließlich zeigt das Jeremiabuch, wie der junge Jeremia und seine Tradenten über ein Jahrhundert nach Israels Katastrophenjahr 720 v.Chr. in Juda von hos. Gedankengut beeinflusst waren. Zu dieser Rezeption gehörten neben hos. Ideen die markante Aufnahme der Wendung “Abtrünnigkeit” (מְשׁוּבָה, Hos 11,7; 14,5), sowie sprachliche Berührungen des Jeremiabuches mit Hosea 3⁶⁴.

⁶² A. GRAUPNER, Art. שׁוּב, *TWAT* VII, 1144-1145.

⁶³ Im Doppelwerk der Hos-Am-Schrift rahmt der Bezug auf die davidische Dynastie die Reflexion der Geschichte Israels (Hos 1,2 – 2,3; Am 9,7-15); vgl. SCHÜTTE, “Amosschrift”, 537.

⁶⁴ Terminologisch weist in Hos 3,1 die Wendung “fremde Götter” (אֱלֹהִים אֲדָרִים) deutlich in einen deuteronomistischen Kontext; neben dem Pentateuch und den Erzählwerken fallen die einzigen prophetischen Belege in Jer auf. Auch der in Hos 3,1 erwähnte “Rosinenkuchen” (אֲשִׁישֵׁי עֲנָבִים) hat offensichtlich einen besonderen Stellenwert in Verbindung mit den fremden Göttern und findet sich in Jer 7,18; 44,15-23 in Verbindung mit den Opfergaben für die “Himmelskönigin”. Nach CH. UEHLINGER, “Die Frau im Efa (Sach 5,5-11)”,

IX. Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis im Prozess

Die Gotteserkenntnis und menschliche Selbsterkenntnis manifestiert sich nach den ältesten Texten der Hoseaschrift in der Pflege und Bewahrung überkommener sozialer Werte. Gerechtigkeit (צדקה) und Recht (משפט) ermöglichen eine Kultur, die von Treue (חסד) geprägt ist. Ihre inhaltliche Füllung erhielten diese Werte aus dem Handeln Gottes, das sich den Menschen in der Gotteserkenntnis (דעת אלהים) erschließt. Daran erinnern die schriftprophetischen Worte, weil Israel im 8. Jh. v.Chr. nicht nur politisch immer mehr in die assyrische Interessensphäre rückte, sondern damit auch vor neue ökonomische Herausforderungen gestellt wurde. Mochte man sich anfänglich teuer gegen die waffentechnologischen Neuerungen der assyrischen Armee gerüstet haben, so beschwerten seit dem verlorenen syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg Tribute an Assur die heimische Ökonomie. Der zugleich aufblühende Fernhandel mit Assur und Ägypten erforderte Investitionen, die nur wenige Wohlhabende aufbringen konnten. Er barg Risiken, die von jenen an die heimischen Warenproduzenten und Zulieferer weitergereicht wurden ⁶⁵.

Die Hoseaschrift bringt die ökonomischen Umwälzungen für Israel wie die politischen Brüche zur Sprache, die schließlich große Teile des Volkes aus seiner Heimat vertrieben. Ihre Texte verhandeln diese Themen vor einem spezifischen Adressatenkreis. Erkennbar sprechen sie Menschen an, die beruflich im Dienst des JHWH-Kultes stehen ⁶⁶. So werden in Hos 4,4 – 10,15 die Fragen der Zeit fokussiert auf die rechte Praktizierung der Religion im Gottesdienst und in der täglichen Lebensführung. In ihrem Kern mar-

BiKi 49 (1994) 93-103, "läßt sich im 7. Jh. in Juda auch ein massiver Anstieg der Produktion von sog. Pfeilerfigurinen feststellen, Darstellungen einer brüstestützenden, mit einem Rock bekleideten Göttin" (101).

⁶⁵ Zum Zusammenspiel der durch Assyrien hervorgerufenen ökonomischen Belastungen für Israel und dem wirtschaftlichen Gewinn einer kleinen, reichen Oberschicht zum Nachteil der Kleinbauern s.a. HONG, *Metaphor*, 121.

⁶⁶ Für israelitische Leviten als Adressaten und Tradenten im jüdischen Kontext sprechen hos. Aussagen über männliche und weibliche Kultbedienstete, eigene Städte und Soldaten, vgl. SCHÜTTE, *Gerechtigkeit*, 163-175, 190. Israelitische Leviten in Juda vermutet B. WEBER, "Der Asaph-Psalter – eine Skizze", *Prophetie und Psalmen*. Festschrift für K. Seybold (eds. B. HUWYLER – H.-P. MATHYS – B. WEBER) (AOAT 280; Münster 2001) 117-141, auch als Produzenten und Tradenten der Asaphpsalmen um 700 v.Chr.

kieren die Anfänge der Hoseaschrift einen Richtungsstreit unter Theologen, bei dem die hos. Tradenten historisch als Sieger hervorgingen. Dass ihre theologische Linie einmal kanonisch würde, war jedoch nicht absehbar, selbst als Hosea 3 in den älteren Text integriert wurde. Die Hoseaschrift steht am Anfang einer religiösen Neuordnung Israels, die sich in Juda vollendete.

Wer ist Gott? Und wer bin ich vor Gott? In den Krisen des 8. Jh. v.Chr. benötigten diese Fragen eine neue Antwort. Die ältesten Texte der Hoseaschrift bringen die drängendsten Fragen eines Theologen jener Zeit, der Hosea genannt wird, auf den Punkt. Neuralgische Punkte der neuen Ökonomie werden benannt, ihre Auswirkungen auf das Bewußtsein der Menschen in Israel, und insbesondere der Religionsbediensteten, bedacht. Das Motiv der Verschuldung vor Gott wird in der zweiten Gerichtsrede (Hos 12,1 – 14,1) zugespitzt. Nach der eingetretenen Katastrophe wird an die menschliche Fähigkeit zur Schuldeinsicht gerührt. Gottes Bekenntnis zu seinem Volk und seine Bereitschaft, die zerbrochene Beziehung zu heilen, wird den Menschen vor Augen gestellt (Hos 11,8-9; 14,5-7). In Hos 14,2-10 wird die menschliche Schuldeinsichtsfähigkeit zur Ausgangsbasis, um die durch Gott bereits ausgesprochene Vergebungszusage aufzunehmen. In der pädagogischen Aufarbeitung von Gottes- und Selbsterkenntnis durch Hos 2,4-25 geht schließlich die theologisch geleitete Schulderkenntnis der Menschen ihrer erneuerten Gotteserkenntnis voraus. Die Verantwortung menschlicher Schuld vor Gott prägt die entstehende Schriftprophetie. Sie bestimmt ihre Auseinandersetzung mit der lokalen jüdischen Theologie im 7. Jh. v.Chr. und mündet in die dtr. Theologie.

Die eigentliche Stärke der Hoseaschrift liegt darin, in der Reflexion ihrer Zeit sich ihres Gottes zu vergewissern, der mit dem Geschick seines Volkes nicht auf Gedeih und Verderb verbunden ist, sondern die Freiheit besitzt, sich selbst zu Gedeih oder Verderb mit seinem Volk zu verbinden. Ihre Genese zeigt die Entwicklung der frühen Schriftprophetie von klaren Worten zur drohenden Krise hin zu dem Gedanken, auch im Scheitern Israels noch auf Gott hoffen zu dürfen ⁶⁷. Nach 720 v.Chr. sind Gerichtsansage und Heils-

⁶⁷ Wenn KRATZ, "Erkenntnis", 291, und KRATZ, "Redaktion", 42-43, zum ersten entscheidenden Schritt auf dem Weg zur Schriftprophetie die theologische Einsicht erklärt, dass Assur mit seiner Drohmacht als Werkzeug des

worte biblisch unauflöslich miteinander verbunden. Hoffen können im Eingestehen von Schuld, und Gott-vertrauen-dürfen trotz eigenem Versagen entwickelt sich zur Kernbotschaft im späteren schriftprophetischen Zeugnis. Damit bereitet die juda-exilische hos. Theologie den Weg, um auch das zweite (babylonische) Exil Israels mit Juda ab 597 v.Chr. geistig und religiös zu bestehen ⁶⁸.

Die Möglichkeit, selbst nach einem katastrophalen Scheitern menschlicher Pläne zu Gott umkehren zu können, seine Verantwortung einzugestehen und durch Gottes Hilfe eine neue Zukunft zu gewinnen, ist die Selbsterkenntnis, welche bereits die Hoseaschrift als Angebot Gottes für sein Volk herausarbeitet. Zu dieser Einsicht tasteten sich die Träger der Hoseaschrift glaubend und, wie die redaktionellen Stücke erkennen lassen, theologisch reflektiert in der Gotteserkenntnis voran. Sie gelangten von dem Nein Gottes gegenüber einem die Gesellschaft zerstörenden Treiben hin zur tieferen Erkenntnis des bedingungslosen Ja Gottes zu seinem Volk in der Krise, das dann aber auch eine bewußte Umkehr Israels erfordert.

Von bleibender Bedeutung sind jene Worte, die Gottes Selbstoffenbarung kommunizieren. Hos 11,8-9; 14,5-7 erneuern die Treuezusage Gottes zu Israel in dunkler Zeit. Sie wurden zum Anker einer religiösen Neubesinnung, die im 7. und 6. Jh. v.Chr. mit den dtr. Ideen in Juda zur Durchsetzung gelangte.

X. Wann entstand die Hoseaschrift

Hos 1,1 nennt die Zeit des Königs Hiskia, in der das Gesamtwerk frühestens seinen Abschluss fand. Seine ältesten Teile erfuhren ihre literarische Abfassung weit früher. Hos 4,4 – 10,15 dürfte noch vor 720 v.Chr. in Israel als literarisches Werk aus verschiedenen Worten Hoseas komponiert worden sein. Hos 12,1 – 14,1 könnte

Gottes Israels verstanden worden sei, so ist dies allein in der Reflexion von Jes evident (z.B. Jes 5,26-29). Da sich nach KRATZ, "Jesajabuch", bereits die ursprüngliche Überlieferung des Judäers Jesaja "israelitisiert" zeigt, dürfte diese Einsicht historisch erst gewonnen worden sein, als israelitische Theologen in Juda Jesajatradition sammelten und verschrifteten; vgl. SCHÜTTE, "Juda", 69.

⁶⁸ Entschiedener als KRATZ, "Israel", 16-17, formuliert, ist der Untergang des Staates Israel 720 v.Chr. als Anfang der theologischen Tradition in Juda zu verstehen. Die überlieferte Tradition Judas ist im Kern israelitische Theologie.

in der Zeit um die assyrische Eroberung Samarias herum entstanden sein. In den ersten Jahren nach 720 v.Chr. und ausweislich der juda-exilischen Redaktion in Juda dürften die Hoffnungsworte von Hosea 11 und 14 den älteren Reden zugefügt worden sein. Hos 1,2 – 2,25 entstand in Juda, als sich neuartige Beziehungen zwischen Flüchtlingen und Einheimischen entwickelten (Hiskiazeit). Hosea 3 setzt selbst einen bedeutenden Abstand vom Jahr 720 v.Chr. an. Es dürfte damit erst in der Manassezeit entstanden sein. Gleiches vermute ich auch für Hos 1,1. Die Hosea-, Amos- und Michaschrift einende Überschrift könnte die literarische Tätigkeit von Tradenten anzeigen, die kritische Erinnerungen in einer Zeit assurfreundlicher staatlicher Politik geltend machen wollten ⁶⁹.

Geschwister Scholl Str. 16
D – 42897 Remscheid

Wolfgang SCHÜTTE

SUMMARY

The book of Hosea was composed a short time after the Assyrian conquest of Israel and by a group of Israelites that had fled to Judah. The kernel of the book comes from a series of critical statements about cultic personnel and Israel's society. The book integrated later reflections on national guilt and tried to infuse religious hope to the Israelite refugees in Judah.

⁶⁹ Dazu s. W. SCHÜTTE, "Die Michaschrift und Israels Exil in Juda", *ZAW* 126 (2014) 254-255.

The Wisdom of Words in the Wisdom of Ben Sira¹

I. Introduction: The Risks of Speech and Language

More so than earlier Hebrew wisdom books, the Wisdom of Ben Sira evidences an obvious concern for language and words. In part this reflects the notion that words are the outward expression of a person's thoughts and character, something reflected in various ways, as in the parallelism of Sir 37,16 (Ms B) "The beginning of any work (is) a word, and the beginning of any deed is a thought", as well as in the assertion that speech is "the test" of a person's character (27,7) ². At the same time, Ben Sira seems to recognize that some things of the external and internal world cannot always be expressed in language, that language is limited. For example, he articulates in several passages the traditional observation that God's "works" defy human description (e.g. Sir 18,4-5; 42,17; 43,28-32). He also writes of his wide experience and the numerous things he has witnessed in his travels; he says of this "my understanding is more than my words" (Sir 34,11) ³. Furthermore, in other passages

¹ This paper was read at the Columbia Hebrew Bible Seminar in February of 2013; thanks to the participants for their lively discussion and constructive criticisms.

² See also 13,25; 25,17; 37,17-18. For the Hebrew text of Ben Sira, see P.C. BEENTJES, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VT 68; Leiden 1997), and the corrections to this work in his, "Errata et Corrigenda", *Ben Sira's God. Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference*, Durham-Ushaw College 2001 (ed. R. EGGER-WENZEL) (BZAW 321; Berlin 2002) 375-377. Also consulted: Z. BEN-HAYYIM, *The Book of Ben Sira. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language; Jerusalem 1973); J. ZIEGLER, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12:2; Göttingen 1965); N. CALDUCH-BENAGES – J. FERRER – J. LIESEN, *La Sabiduría del Escriba / The Wisdom of the Scribe* (Biblioteca Midrásica 1; Estella 2003); *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem, 12: Sapientia Salomonis, Liber Hiesu filii Sirach* (Roma 1964); M.G. ABEGG – C. TOWES, "Ben Sira and Tagging", *Accordance* 9.5 (Altamonte Springs, FL 2007-2009).

³ Cf. Theognis, 419-420.

he implies that language can be misleading, that words do not always indicate what they purport to describe, as when he writes: “there is a friend (that has only) the name of friend” (Sir 37,1) ⁴. In the end, however, Ben Sira’s book is not a treatise on the philosophy of language; it mostly concerns practical ways of living a pious, fruitful life, and thus much of what Ben Sira says on the topic of language relates directly to its repercussions on a person and his or her status in society.

The impact of language on one’s status is succinctly conveyed in both Hebrew versions of Sir 5,13:

ולשון אדם מפלתו	כבוד וקלון ביד בושא	Ms A
ולשון אדם מפלישו	כבוד וקלון ביד בושה	Ms C

Honor and shame are in the grasp of one speaking quickly (or, derive from quick speech), but the tongue of a person is (often) his downfall (Ms C: ... is what delivers him) (Sir 5,13; Mss A and C).

Not only does each version of the verse juxtapose the mutually exclusive potential results of speech, “honor” and “shame”, but the version from Ms A represents spoken language as one’s (potential) downfall and that from Ms C as one’s (potential) source of deliverance ⁵. The discrepancies between the Hebrew versions, I assume, are not attributable to Ben Sira himself, but they do reinforce the original idea of the verse, if not also the ambiguities inherent in the orthography and morphology of Hebrew.

⁴ The Hebrew (in Ms Bm) is אך יש אהב שם אהב; Ms C is similar.

⁵ Both the Greek and Syriac translation suggest that מפלתו of Ms A is the preferred reading; see H.P. RÜGER, *Text und Textform im Hebräischen Sirach* (BZAW 112; Berlin 1970) 40–41. Most early scholars of the Hebrew text assume that the word בושא represents generic speech, though N. Peters in his initial publication from 1902 understands the word to denote rushed speaking. See I. LÉVI, *L’Ecclesiastique* (Paris 1898–1901) 2:28; R. SMEND, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, erklärt* (Berlin 1906) 51, and *Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin 1906) 9; G.H. BOX – W.O.E. OESTERLEY, “Sirach”, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. R.H. CHARLES) (Oxford 1913) 1:333; N. PETERS, *Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus* (Freiburg 1902) 328, and *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus* (EHAT 25; Münster 1913) 54. The context of Sir 5,13 and the connotations of the Hebrew root both imply that the word denotes hasty or rash speech, despite the more generic translations of the Greek and Syriac (λαλιά, *mmll*).

As a result of the risks and benefits of linguistic communication, Ben Sira's book attempts to specify particular ways that one can properly use language. Often the advice reflects the complicated social context in which young scribes and administrators found themselves, one that required the scribe to express the right thought in the right way at the right time. For example, one is encouraged to be sincere (Sir 5,9-10) and friendly with "sweet discourse" (Sir 6,5), but not to be duplicitous or "double-tongued" (Sir 5,14 – 6,1; 28,12-26). One is told to be cautious in giving advice or criticism (Sir 1,24; 5,11-12; 11,7-8; 33,4) even to sometimes remain silent (20,1.5-8.19-20; 21,26; 22,27; 31,31; 32,4.7), but not always so, since "Wisdom is made known through words" (Sir 4,24) and since there is little worth in hidden wisdom (20,30-31; 41,14-15). Connected with the difficulties of knowing what to say and when to say it, a scribe would also have confronted the complexities inherent in the medium of communication itself. There are two basic realms which can confound communication and which are explored below: linguistic factors (phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics) and extra-linguistic factors (the context of who, where, when, and how something is said).

The following paper illustrates how these dimensions of communication are addressed by Ben Sira. In sum, Ben Sira warns his readers in various ways that an utterance made in one context can have a different meaning or significance in another context. That is, the same words uttered at two different times and/or by two different people can have two entirely different meanings and effects. Such caution reflects, in part, Ben Sira's recognition that individuals have different perspectives and biases and will not always perceive the same phenomena in the same way. In addition to context, Ben Sira's teachings address linguistic ambiguity; this is done mostly indirectly by illustrating how individual words can have multiple meanings. Ben Sira's proverbs, in fact, are often predicated on the multiple meanings and nuances of words like "glory" and "prudence", even on expanding additional meanings for words like "shame", in effect finding and introducing ambiguities into words. This is not to mention the fact that his poetry evinces numerous expressions whose impact depends, to some extent, on ambiguity created through various kinds of wordplay and metaphor, the purpose of some of which seems to be increasing the linguistic dexterity of his students.

II. Past Research

Although the topics of context and ambiguity in communication are intuitive and easily recognizable problems, and although they are partially addressed in classical literature, this was not a particular point of interest in other Hebrew texts before Ben Sira. Thus, these are not the subject of much scholarly attention. Nevertheless, ambiguity is explicitly mentioned briefly in a longer work on speech in Ben Sira by John Ifeanyichukwu Okoye ⁶. Where Okoye discusses ambiguity, he is referring only to insincere and misleading communication, things which the ideal speaker will always avoid; he does not refer to the kind of ambiguous language found in wordplay and metaphor. Okoye stresses that the ideal speaker must be certain of what he or she is saying, an ideal speaker must be “firm” and “steadfast in what he knows” ⁷. Okoye goes on to write:

This firmness in knowledge is to prevent the language user from having double thoughts, which could give rise to double ways of signification ... Once convinced of what he knows, there is no danger of duplicity in thinking or in speech; ambiguity would be eliminated. The language user's words will always have the same meaning ⁸.

While Okoye's description of the ideal speaker may be correct, it obscures some of the more interesting aspects of Ben Sira's views on communication. As with other aspects of his teaching, Ben Sira's attitude on communication admits of a certain tension between idealistic advice and that which is practical. For example, he writes that one must “argue for righteousness to the death” (Sir 4,28) and,

⁶ J.I. OKOYE, *Speech in Ben Sira with Special Reference to 5,9 – 6,1* (European University Studies. Theology 535; Frankfurt am Main 1995) 34. On the subject of speech in Ben Sira, see also A.A. DI LELLA, “Use and Abuse of the Tongue: Ben Sira 5,9 – 6,1”, “*Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit ...*”. Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit, Diethelm Michel zum 65. Geburtstag (eds. A.A. DIESEL et al.) (BZAW 241; Berlin 1996) 33-48 and IDEM, “Ben Sira's Doctrine on the Discipline of the Tongue: An Intertextual and Synchronic Analysis”, *Wisdom of Ben Sira. Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (eds. A. PASSARO – G. BELLIA) (DCL 1; Berlin 2008) 233-252.

⁷ OKOYE, *Speech*, 95. See also similar statements in *Speech*, 107, 183.

⁸ OKOYE, *Speech*, 95.

as stated above, not withhold wisdom ⁹. But he also suggests that when one's ideas do not comport with those of the powerful or wealthy, one should not expose one's views. In 8,1-2 he encourages not "contending" or quarrelling with the rich, in 8,14 not going to court against a judge; in 9,13 one should not anger the person who has the authority to kill. Moreover, an individual should not engage with nobles who are always looking to undermine others (13,9-11). In relation to speech specifically, Bradley C. Gregory observes that although Ben Sira posits a traditional polarity whereby a fool is garrulous and a sage is discreet, Ben Sira does seem to suggest that even the wise will "sin with their tongue" (Sir 19,16) and that, therefore, one should be empathetic toward those who have also said something inappropriate ¹⁰. Thus, contrary to Okoye's depiction of the ideal speaker, Ben Sira himself exhibits conflicting ideas. Moreover, he expresses himself through ambiguous language (wordplay), and his proverbs depend, in certain instances, on ambiguity for their effect.

From a practical perspective, then, it seems likely to me that Ben Sira did not wish to encourage people to purge their language of all words and sentences that could be interpreted in two or more ways. Rather, it seems, he likely thought that imprecision in communication was an inevitable aspect of language and of the people using it, a natural result of people having different perspectives and interests and holding different biases.

⁹ The phrase "to the death" (Ms A *עד המות*) is ambiguous itself. It is often taken to imply that one should argue even if it results in one's demise, e.g., P.W. SKEHAN – A.A. DI LELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York 1987) 177, though it could also imply until one's old age (cf. 2 Sam 6,23; 1 Kgs 11,40; Jer 52,34). In Jon 4,9 the phrase *עד-מות* occurs in a statement that can be translated: "It is right (that) it angers me to the point of dying". The same Hebrew phrase without the definite article occurs with the sense "to death" in Ms D to Sir 37,2; Ms B expresses the same idea with *אל מות*, while Ms C has a different phrasing. On the different Hebrew versions, see S. ELITZUR, "A New Hebrew Fragment of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)", *Tarbiz* 76 (2006-2007) 17-28, here 22, and IDEM, "Two New Leaves of the Hebrew Version of Ben Sira", *DSD* 17 (2010) 13-29, here 21-22. The sense "to the point of dying" is expressed in phrases like *למות* in Isa 53,12.

¹⁰ B.C. GREGORY, "Slips of the Tongue in the Speech Ethics of Ben Sira", *Bib* 93 (2012) 321-339, here 330-333.

III. The Flexibility of Meaning Based on Context

Ben Sira's teaching stresses in various ways the importance of considering other people's perspectives. Ben Sira writes that one should not neglect those mourning and should even "mourn with the mourner" (7,34). He admonishes his audience that they "not humiliate the one repenting of sin" and then adds "remember we are all guilty" (8,5). He asks in another passage: "One who has no mercy for a person like himself, can he ask forgiveness for his sins?" (28,4; Gr). In the context of a dinner party he advises: "Know your neighbor like yourself, consider all that you dislike" (31,15; Ms B). Ben Sira also recognizes that the biases and proclivities that people bear over mundane affairs are often different. Observing that people will give advice to suit their own needs (and not that of the person asking for advice), he writes that one should not consult, for example, "a coward about battle ... a merchant about prices" (37,11; Ms B). In another passage he notes: "Not everyone (finds) desirable [lit., good] (the same) pleasure, not everyone chooses the same thing" (37,28; Ms B and Bm). This view of humanity suggests that in certain matters some people will never agree. It is not surprising, therefore, that Ben Sira assumes that people interpret certain utterances in different ways, based on their invested interests and their biases.

The sycophancy of social inferiors and the general bias against the poor are revealed in the following passage that treats the interpretation of speech.

ודבריו מכוערין מן(ה)ופין	עשיר מדבר ועזריו רבים
ודבר משכיל ואין לו מקום	דל נמוט גע גע ושא
ואת שכלו עד עב יגיעו	עשיר דובר הכל נסכתו
ואם נתקל גם הם יהדפוהו	דל דובר מי זה יאמרו

The rich (person) speaks and his friends are many,
 though his words are repugnant, they are considered beautiful.
 The poor speaks (read מדבר instead of נמוט) and they utter (read שא) a rebuke (read נערה),
 though he speaks a wise thing, he (or, it) has no place (among them).
 The rich speaks and all are silent,
 his insight they lift to the clouds.
 The poor speaks (and) they say "Who is this?"
 and if he stumbles, they drive him away (13,22-23; Ms A).

The passage is problematic for several reasons. First, in verse 22b, the Hebrew participles presumably represent the original sense (something reflected in the Syriac), despite the fact that the Greek aorist indicatives imply finite forms (“he speaks abominable [things] and they justify him”) ¹¹. In 22c, the text is corrupt as almost all commentators agree. The mistaken introduction of the word “stumbles” in place of “one who speaks” (מְדַבֵּר) is perhaps influenced by the preceding verse (13,21) which uses the Qal and Niphal forms of the verb מִיט. The repetition of the syllable גַּע to indicate an inarticulate sound is not found elsewhere in Hebrew, but is suggested by the noun גַּעגַע (which is apparently related to the verb גָּעַה “to low”). The Syriac, whose translation of the entire colon parallels the Hebrew text of Ms A, contains the etymologically related gw’ (= “interjection of disgust and contempt” [LS³]). The Greek, on the other hand, presumes the verb נָעַר “to rebuke” ¹². The last word of 13,22c is presumably a mistake for יִשְׁאוּ “they lift”, in the sense of lifting the voice; the verb occurs in this sense without a word for “voice” in Isa 3,7; 42,2.11. In 22d, מְשַׁכִּיל may indicate a kind of text, though it is conceivable we should see this as a Hiphil participle referring to a person, similar to how the word appears elsewhere in Ben Sira, and translate “(as) one wise”. By contrast, both the Greek (σύνεσις) and Syriac (dšpyr) imply an abstract word akin to the following bicolon’s שָׂכַל or something more generic like טוֹב, יָפָה, or חָסֵד ¹³. Despite the corrupt and somewhat obscure text, the verse seems to imply that the interpretation of speech (and more broadly language) is influenced by who says it. That is, the context of who says something influences the interpretation of the words: An utterance is more likely to be believed if spoken by a member of the wealthy elite than if spoken by a poor person.

The disparity between what is said and how it is evaluated is highlighted through the juxtaposition of antonymous participles in 22b. In addition, notice that what the rich person says in 22b is

¹¹ For מְדַבֵּר, cf. Sir 11,2. For a similar syntax, cf. 2 Sam 13,31. For more on this verse, see LÉVI, *L’Ecclésiastique*, 2:97, and W.T. VAN PEURSEN, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 41; Leiden 2004) 349.

¹² See M.Z. SEGAL, *Sefer Ben Sira* (Jerusalem 1953) 86.

¹³ See the Syriac translation to Sir 3,31; 14,16; 37,11; M.M. WINTER, *A Concordance to the Peshiṭta Version of Ben Sira* (Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 2; Leiden 1976) 632.

called “repugnant”, while in (the Hebrew to) 23b what the rich says is labeled “insight” (שכל, though the Greek has the more generic λόγος and the Syriac has a different sense). Is Ben Sira reflecting the fact, as explained above, that what a rich person speaks is not entirely wrong (and ugly), but usually contains a degree of truth, or is he illustrating in a subtle manner how what is untrue can become thought of as true among unmindful listeners? It is difficult to be sure. But, in either case, the shift from “repugnant” to “insight” implies that what is X can be called Y; words do not always represent what they purportedly describe. The homonymous relationship between שכל “insight” (either *sēkel* or *sekel* according to Tiberian pronunciation [*< *sikl* or **sakl*]) and סכל “folly” (*sekel* according to Tiberian pronunciation [*< *sikl* or **sakl* ?]) only further highlights this point. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned, we cannot be certain that Ben Sira intends wordplay in this case since it would be impossible to use the word “folly” or “insight” without somehow conjuring the antonym/homonym, and in such cases the native ear might have been preconditioned to disambiguate the two words.

In addition to biases and skewed perspectives due to social hierarchies, Ben Sira recognizes that the context of when and where something is said can alter its significance or meaning. For example, although Ben Sira advocates reproving a friend or associate in relation to rumors (Sir 19,15-16, quoted below), he warns against an admonition at the wrong time (20,1) and any kind of admonition at a festive occasion.

At a banquet, do not reprove a friend,
do not cause him agony in his joy;
Do not speak a word of reproach to him,
do not press him by approaching (him) (בגנשה) (Sir 31,31; Ms F) ¹⁴.

Thus, the same words of admonition said at two different times might imply two different things. At the right time, an admonition conveys respect and love, but at the wrong time it may imply disrespect, or, even more damagingly, it may communicate a secret and hence constitute betrayal, the effects of which Ben Sira character-

¹⁴ I have translated the last word assuming it is from the root גנש “to approach”. Alternatively, this might be an otherwise unattested noun related to גנש “to oppress” or an infinitive of this same verb.

izes as dire (Sir 27,16-19). Conversely, those Ben Sira refers to as “fools” may utter the right words, but, if they do, it is always at the wrong time and, therefore, they count for naught.

From a fool’s mouth a proverb (παράβολή) is rejected
for he does not say it at the right time (Sir 20,20; Gr) ¹⁵.

As with the other passages discussed above, the same words can be construed differently based on their context. On the other hand, a shift in the temporal context of advice might make it more meaningful, as suggested by Ben Sira’s address: “Listen, my child, do not despise me, later you will accept my words” (Sir 31,22, Ms B) ¹⁶.

Ben Sira also recognizes that not knowing the original context in which something was said means that one does not know its real significance. Such seems to be implied in verses that address the proper response at hearing gossip.

Admonish a friend, for often it is (just) slander;
and do not believe everything you hear (lit., every word).
There is one who slips (in speech), but not from intention (ἀπὸ ψυχῆς),
and who has not sinned with his tongue? (Sir 19,15-16; Gr) ¹⁷.

Here, Ben Sira insists that it is necessary to find the person about whom something is said before trusting gossip about his or her apparent fault; this reflects, in part, an unreliability due to an unknown original context. For example, what a person hears about a friend’s speech-fault (whatever the specific nature of that fault is) may obscure the off-hand way in which it was said, or some other detail that would reveal it to be unintentional ¹⁸.

¹⁵ The Syriac has the same sense, though it has *mlt*’ (“word”) where the Greek has παράβολή.

¹⁶ I assume שָׁמַע בְּנִי אֵל תְּבוּז לִי וּבִאֲחֵרִית תִּשְׁנֶה אִמְרֵי for the Hebrew text of Ms B, which follows the reading of earlier scholars, like LÉVI, *L’Ecclésiastique*, 2:46, and most others.

¹⁷ The Greek ἀπὸ ψυχῆς probably reflects the Hebrew מִן־לֵב, as in Num 16,28 and Lam 3,33.

¹⁸ See observations on this passage in GREGORY, “Slips of the Tongue”, 331-332.

In a similar way, Sir 27,23 illustrates how the second-hand repetition of one's words may also alter their meaning, especially when the person repeating them is an antagonist ¹⁹.

In your presence, his mouth is sweet,
and he is amazed at your words,
but later, he perverts his speech (lit., mouth)
and through your words (ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου) he sets a snare
(σκάνδαλον) (Sir 27,23; Gr).

The passage does not mention any imprecision or slip of the tongue that gives rise to the perversion of speech, and thus it seems that the initial speaker's words are not what has caused his or her slander. It is possible that the fourth colon describes how a slanderer changes the words he has heard (in effect, reflecting the sense: "in your words he introduces something offensive"); usually the sense of σκάνδαλον is "trap, snare" (LSJ), though in this passage from Sirach it may imply something offensive, as it does in Jdt 5,20 and 12,2 and in New Testament texts. Box and Oesterley, for example, suggest that the Hebrew underlying the Greek may be similar to that of Sir 11,31: וּבִמְחֻרֵי יָתֵן קֶשֶׁר (Ms A = Greek ἐπιθήσει μῶμον); they explain their understanding of the verse through a paraphrase: "he will conspire against thee by wresting thy words and putting a wrong meaning upon them, and thus cause thee to give offence to others" ²⁰. All the same, most translators understand the prepositional phrase ἐν τοῖς λόγοις to imply instrumentality and understand the combination of words "to give" and "trap" more literally, reflecting perhaps a Hebrew idiom like that in Lev 19,14 (תֵּן לְמַכְשׁוֹר = προσθήσεις σκάνδαλον). This would not imply, therefore, that the slanderer has changed the original words, but rather that he or she has changed their context (by, for example, altering how they were said or obscuring their original intention). In either case, the contrast of "in your presence" and "later" may reflect a recognition that the interpretation of a given set of words can change based on

¹⁹ The thematically similar remark in Sir 11,31, "a murmurer (נִרְנֵן) will turn good to bad", probably does not reflect the original idea of the verse (see the versions).

²⁰ BOX – OESTERLEY, "Sirach", 407. Note also that one Greek manuscript reads "he perverts your speech".

where and when they are repeated and/or who repeats them. In relation to this, note Sir 6,9 where Ben Sira recognizes that there is danger in someone else repeating what you have spoken or done: “There is a friend who turns to an enemy, and will lay bare the dispute of your insult (רִיב חִרְפֶּתְךָ)” (Ms A)²¹.

The preceding passages illustrate that Ben Sira was conscious of the variability in linguistic interpretation provided by the shifting circumstances of speech: the context of when, where, how, and by whom particular words were spoken. As the following paragraphs indicate, Ben Sira was also aware of how the various components of language could create multiple interpretations.

IV. Ambiguity due to Syntax, Morphology, and Phonology

A sensitivity to the effects of ambiguous words and syntax is apparent in the work of almost all poets, but Ben Sira’s use of ambiguous language (including that which depends on polysemous and homophonous words) seems particularly integral to his teaching. His teaching not only emphasizes the fact that people will interpret words in different ways, but also that many ideas or beliefs are more complicated than people often assume. For example, he writes that “shame” (בִּשְׁת) is sometimes not shameful (Sir 4,21), that glory (δόξα) can lead to “diminishment” (ἐλάττωσις) (20,11), that prudence (πανουργία) can lead to bitterness (21,12), that death can be a relief (41,2). Even the most basic of concepts, like “good”, are not easy to identify: “[All these things (i.e., human necessities like water, fire, salt, milk) are good for those who are good, but] are turned loathsome [for those who are wicked]” (Sir 39,27 Mas [Ms B]). In some cases, Ben Sira uses ambiguous and confusing language to highlight the difficulties in communicating due to vagaries of context as well as to undermine certain assumptions about basic concepts.

We have already seen one example of syntactic ambiguity that underlines the disparity in interpretation created through disparity

²¹ Ms C has the same text, except for the last word where it reads “he will withhold [יִחַשֵׁךְ]”, a corruption presumably; see ELITZUR, “A New Hebrew Fragment”, 23, and IDEM, “Two New Leaves”, 22-23.

in social rank or power. In Sir 13,22 two participles (one Pual, the other Hophal or Hiphil) indicate opposite ideas and are juxtaposed:

עשיר מדבר וערזיו רבים ודבריו מכוערין מנהלופין

The rich (person) speaks and his friends are many,
though his words are repugnant, they are considered beautiful (13,22; Ms A).

The absence of any conjunction between the participles makes the syntax of the verse initially confusing, though it also helps to drive home the idea being expressed ²².

The use of ambiguous syntax is also used to highlight the innovative way that Ben Sira thinks of “shame” in 4,21 ²³.

כי יש בשאת משאת עון ויש בשת כבוד ורחן

For there is a shame that causes one to bear guilt
and a shame (that causes one to bear) honor and grace (4,21; Ms A).

Here, the word order of 21b parallels that of 21a and suggests the ellipsis of the participle (an understanding supported by the Syriac). All the same, a reader is tempted to understand *בשת* to be in construct with the following nouns and translate: “there is a shame of honor and grace” (the word *בשת* occurs elsewhere in construct with following nouns, e.g., *בשת עלומיד* [Isa 54,4], *בשת ערות אמן*, [1 Sam 20,30], *בשת פנים* [2 Chr 32,21]), which may be reflected in the Greek translation: “there is a shame (that is) grace and honor” ²⁴.

²² A similar rhetoric of juxtaposing antonyms is used in Sir 3,10 (Ms A); 6,29 (Ms A); 6,30 (Ms A); 10,28 (Ms A, B); 12,9a (Ms A); 13,20 (Ms A); 33,6 (Ms E).

²³ Ben Sira addresses this same topic in greater detail in the long poem 41,14 – 42,8, for which one may consult E.D. REYMOND, “Remarks on Ben Sira’s ‘Instruction on Shame’ (Sirach 41,14 – 42,8)”, *ZAW* 115 (2003) 388–400.

²⁴ The Greek might be translated: “For, there is a shame that brings sin, and there is shame (that is) glory and grace”. M. Kister writes in relation to this verse: “Ben Sira’s statement ... is deliberately provocative: such a general statement turns upside down laudable qualities and good manners”. See M. KISTER, “Some Notes on Biblical Expressions and Allusions and the Lexicography of Ben Sira”, *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages*. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University, 15–17 December 1997 (eds.

In any case, the juxtaposition of words that should be mutually exclusive is jarring and makes the reader pause and, subsequently, reflect on Ben Sira's message that not all shame is bad. It might be added that this reading of the verse does not negate the possibility that Ben Sira is using the word **בשת** in a way that is more in line with how it is used in some later Hebrew texts, where it implies bashfulness and not outright shame; since biblical texts universally present **בשת** as a negative thing, we may assume that an ancient reader would have thought initially that Ben Sira was using it in this sense too. Essentially the same sentiment is reiterated later in Sir 41,16, though in this latter verse the relevant terms are not juxtaposed and the effect is less dramatic, though still paradoxical. This latter verse reads in the Mas scroll: **לֹא כָל בִּשְׁת נֹאדָה לְבוֹשׁ** "not every shame merits shameful feelings"²⁵.

The use of polysemous words and ambiguous morphology is also used to highlight subtle nuances or an innovative angle on a particular topic. For example, the ambiguous meaning of the Hithpael conjugation is used to condense the seemingly contradictory advice that one should not appear too ambitious or too aloof²⁶.

אֵל תִּתְקַרֵּב בֶּן תִּתְרַחֵק וְאֵל תִּתְרַחֵק בֶּן תִּשְׁנֵא

Do not bring yourself forward lest you become a stranger,
but do not keep far off, lest you are hated (Sir 13,10; Ms A).

Here, it would seem, the initial use of the verb is passive and the second reflexive²⁷. Such is implied not only by the Greek and

²⁵ See E.D. REYMOND, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*. Parallelism and the Poems of Sirach (SBL 9; Atlanta, GA 2004) 49-50.

²⁶ This contradictory advice is also echoed in other ways; compare Sir 4,22 with 7,5 and 10,26. Note also the parallel to 13,10 in *The Instruction of Ankhsheshonq* (XVII,8-10) and in *Papyrus Insinger* (X,12-13), the latter of which J.T. Sanders views as certainly related to Sir 13,10; see J.T. SANDERS, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBLMS 28; Chico, CA 1983) 85. The Demotic text does not include wordplay.

²⁷ A more linguistically sophisticated description of these two uses is offered by Benton; the first **תִּתְרַחֵק** he says expresses the process of "becoming" far, while the second describes the act of behaving as if far. See R.C. BENTON, "Aspect and the Biblical Hebrew Niphal and Hitpael", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Madison, WI 2009) 368. Both these functions are common to the Hithpael from early Hebrew onward according to Benton.

Syriac translations but also by the expectations of the parallelism where the first command (a reflexive notion) is likely echoed in the second command (at the beginning of the second colon) and the first negative result is likely echoed in the second negative result (a passive notion)²⁸. However, the verb could be construed in both cola as reflexive: “do not be forward lest you make yourself distant and do not make yourself distant lest you be hated”. Although a single instance of this verb form would imply this ambiguity, by repeating the word Ben Sira highlights the ambiguity and forces the reader/listener to recognize it and, thus, to confront the difficulty of interacting with superiors.

In other cases the repetition of a word in different meanings points to a re-evaluation of a basic assumption. An example is found in 40,29 (Mas and Ms B) where the word “life” is repeated: “As for the person always attentive at a stranger’s table, / one cannot count his life (חַיִּי) a life (חַיִּים)”²⁹. Ben Sira is here playing on the different notions of “life”: the span of time one is alive and “happiness ... consisting of earthly felicity” (BDB, s.v.). In addition, it would seem, given the topic of the verse, he is also playing with the rarer meaning “sustenance” (found in Prov 27,27; Sir 29,21; 31,27; 39,26), implying that a sycophant’s sustenance is not truly sustaining³⁰. Other examples of a similar kind of shift in meaning are also found, like “The wisdom (חִכְמָה) of the scribe increases wisdom (חִכְמָה)” (Sir 38,24), and “If you fall (נָפַל), he will not fall (נָפַל) to rescue you” (Sir 12,15), though these may not represent Ben Sira’s original language.

²⁸ See E.D. REYMOND, “Wordplay in the Hebrew to Ben Sira”, *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira* (eds. J.-S. REY – J. JOOSTEN) (SJSJ 150; Leiden 2011) 37-53, here 43. The Greek has ἀπωσθήσῃ (the subj. aorist passive of ἀπωθέω “lest you be pushed back”) and μακρὰν ἀφίστω (“go far off”), while the Syriac repeats the verb *rhq*, first (one assumes) in the tA-stem (“be removed”) and then in the tD-stem (“to go far away”).

²⁹ The translation “attentive” for מְשִׁיחַ עַל is based on the usage of the verb in post-biblical Hebrew, as well as on the Greek translation (βλέπων εἰς [see LSJ, s.v., def. II.2]), the Syriac translation (*sbr* ʾl), and the custom of guests serving food and drink implied in Sir 29,24-27. See E.D. REYMOND, *Even unto a Spark. An Analysis of the Parallelistic Structure in the Wisdom of Ben Sira* 40,11 – 44,15 (Ph.D. diss.; Chicago, IL 1999) 142-143.

³⁰ For more on this meaning of the word “life”, see E.D. REYMOND, “The Meanings of ‘Life’ in the Hebrew to Ben Sira”, *JBL* 132 (2013) 327-332.

V. Purpose of Wordplay and Ambiguous Constructions

Wordplay is not unique to Ben Sira, but is also found in other wisdom texts, like Proverbs, Qohelet, and Job. In these texts, the wordplay, especially that which is an integral part of a text's expression, reflects a conception of language on the part of the writers/composers that is, in general, similar to Ben Sira's, namely that ambiguous and confusing language can be exploited for expressive purposes. But, in these other texts, spoken or written expression is not a main focus, nor is it so obvious that one primary audience for the texts is future scribes or administrators. The fact that Ben Sira does discuss human language and communication at length in the context of scribal/administrative training means that the wordplay in Ben Sira and the ambiguity that it involves take on a significance not present in the same way in the other wisdom books. This is especially true since, as demonstrated in some of the examples above, he uses wordplay as part of his discussion of communication. The practical function of such wordplay, in general, would have been two-fold: first, to train the reader to perceive the multivalency inherent in words, verb forms, and syntax; and, second, to demonstrate how such ambiguities could be useful in creating one's own "wise" expressions, perhaps, even to discover the inherent connections between certain concepts or ideas.

Although Ben Sira has no specific cautionary remarks in relation to the ambiguity generated through syntax, morphology, and phonology (he does not, for instance, warn his readers of the dangers inherent in the multivalency of words), nevertheless, it is safe to assume that as someone training future scribes and administrators, Ben Sira is keen on developing his students' sensitivity to and dexterity with such multivalent symbols. The importance of general linguistic competence is stressed in many passages in Ben Sira.

The one wise through words (ἐν λόγοις) makes himself beloved,
the gratitude of fools is uttered in vain (Sir 20,13)³¹.

³¹ The text differs from Ziegler's edition, which has (instead of ἐν λόγοις) ἐν ὀλίγοις (attested in the single manuscript 253, while most others have the text above). The Hebrew is almost non-sensical. The Syriac does not exist, but the Latin (*sapiens in verbis*) supports ἐν λόγοις. Many understand the verse in a manner like that reflected in my translation above. See PETERS,

The one wise through words (ἐν λόγοις) promotes himself,
and the intelligent person will please nobles (Sir 20,27; Gr) ³².

As (there is) a lot of smoke above fire
so the discourses of a person (betray his) deliberation (Sir 27,5; Syr) ³³.

Before he speaks, you should not praise someone,
for this is the test of a person (Sir 27,7; Gr) ³⁴.

The importance of understanding complex, ambiguous language seems to be implied where Ben Sira encourages his readers to “abandon themselves” in riddles.

ובחידתיהם התרשש	אל תמש שיחת חכמים
להתיצב לפני שרים	כי ממנו תלמנן לקח

Do not forsake the meditation of the wise,
in their riddles abandon yourself (or read הנה “meditate”),
for from it you will learn understanding,
to stand before princes (8,8; Ms A) ³⁵.

Ecclesiasticus, 97-98, 364; RÜGER, *Text und Textform*, 2-3; SKEHAN – DI LELLA, *Ben Sira*, 296; P.C. BEENTJES, “Full Wisdom is Fear of the Lord: Ben Sira 19,20 – 20,31, Context, Composition, and Content”, *Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom (Sir 14,20)*. Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira [Leuven 2006] 87-106, here 102-104, originally published in *EstBib* 47 (1989) 27-45; J. MARBÖCK, *Jesus Sirach 1–23* (HThKAT; Freiburg 2010) 239, 241. On the other hand, many choose to combine the possibilities into something like “in few words”; see, e.g., PETERS, *Sirach*, 160, 165.

³² Here again, the text is distinct from that of Ziegler in the phrase ἐν λόγοις (see the above footnote). There is no Hebrew text here and no Greek reading for Ziegler’s choice of ἐν ὀλίγοις. The Latin supports the text offered above, while the Syriac has a slightly different sense: “One full of words of wisdom”.

³³ The translation is that of CALDUCH-BENAGES et al., *Wisdom of the Scribe*, 174. Contrast this version with the Hebrew (Ms A) and Greek that instead of “discourses” mention “reckoning” (חשבונני) and “reasoning” (or, discussion; διαλογισμός).

³⁴ The Hebrew and Syriac do not exist for this verse.

³⁵ The root רשש in Biblical Hebrew means to dash to pieces and occurs in the Piel and Pual. In Targumic Aramaic (e.g., Onq to Lev 26,43 = Heb Niphal עזב), the root occurs in the tG and tD stems meaning “to be abandoned, scattered” (Jastrow). Conceivably, Ben Sira knew a corresponding Hebrew verb

Here, it is conceivable that what Ben Sira means is simply that one must learn what past sages have said about proper etiquette as an administrator and be able to act in accordance with these instructions in order to be successful. More likely, however, something more complex is being expressed. The word חידה usually refers to texts that are difficult to understand at first hearing, texts that require concentration and thinking and that may involve ambiguous syntax or grammar, as well as metaphor ³⁶. No doubt Ben Sira means to imply that proverbial literature provides a student with basic knowledge about how one should act and behave, but it also suggests a linguistic sensitivity and dexterity, something that would have come from studying riddles.

The inference that linguistic dexterity is one goal of wisdom training is further supported by the way Ben Sira writes of the scribe in his discussion of different vocations, where it seems texts that incorporate ambiguity, like riddles, provide the grist for meditation and cogitation.

He will seek out the hidden things (ἀπόκρυφα) of parables,
and the riddles of proverbs he will dwell upon (Sir 39,3; Gr).

Such “hidden things” in Ben Sira likely refer not to “occult” knowledge, as a similar phrase might if found in a Dead Sea Scroll (e.g., רזי נהיה), but rather to the multiple meanings of a passage or assertion that are, in part, communicated through wordplay, which in turn often depends on ambiguity. The ambiguity that is often part of texts like “proverbs” and “riddles” would have heightened their pedagogical usefulness by forcing the reader to engage with the text in a dynamic way (here reflected in the verbs “seek out” [ἐκζητέω] and “dwell upon” [ἀναστρέφω]), training the student

that had a reflexive sense in the Hithpael. Alternatively, we should view the verb רטש as secondary, included by a scribe due to its similarity (both semantic and phonetic) with נטש. Notice, e.g., that in post-biblical Hebrew, the Qal passive participle רטוש occurs meaning “an emigrant”, and is used as a pair with the Qal passive participle of נטש. Although some earlier scholars have suggested reading דרש for the root רטש following the Syriac, another possibility is to see the Greek verb, ἀναστρέφω, as a translation of הגה “to meditate”, as in Sir 50,28, where the Hebrew verb is accompanied by the *beth* preposition.

³⁶ See, V. HAMP, “חידה”, *TDOT* IV, 320-323.

to be sensitive to the many meanings that words can have especially in crucial contexts with superiors.

The goal of such study seems to be not only knowledge of what the proverb says, but also how it is said. This is implied not only in the passages quoted above that connect language use with character and intelligence, but also in other places. Ben Sira makes the assertion that linguistic intelligence can lead to (or, at least, is associated with) wisdom.

συνετοὶ ἐν λόγοις καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσοφίσαντο
καὶ ἀνώμβησαν παροιμίας ἀκριβεῖς

Those intelligent in words become wise (or, display wisdom),
and pour forth exact proverbs (Sir 18,29) ³⁷.

Of course, what Ben Sira means by “intelligent in words” is not patently obvious. However, the suggestion that this involves being conscious of the multivalency inherent in individual lexemes and roots is encouraged by the way that Ben Sira calls attention to links between related words.

In perhaps as many as four places Ben Sira calls attention to a link between words with the phrase “like its/his/her name” (i.e., *kaph* preposition + ׁשׁ + pronoun). In two of these cases, Ben Sira conveys a comparison between etymologically related words that are phonetically distinct. The clearest example of this is found in Sir 43,8, which highlights the associations between the word “new moon” and the verb “to make new”:

חדש כשמו הוא מת[חדש] [מה-נורא בהשתנות]

The new moon, as its name (implies), [renews] itself;
[how breath-taking when it alters] (Sir 43,8; Mas [Ms B]) ³⁸.

³⁷ The verb σοφίζω in the middle voice indicates either being wise, gaining wisdom, or displaying the same (see LEH, s.v.). The Syriac translation, *ḥkmy ywlpn* “wise in instruction”, may point to a Hebrew phrase חכמי מוסר, suggesting, at least for this verse, that the Greek expression ἐν λόγοις modifies the preceding noun. See the discussion on the similar phrase in 20,13, quoted above. Note also that Sir 32,8 stresses the necessity of saying much in few words.

³⁸ REYMOND, *Innovations in Hebrew Poetry*, 65-66. Note that a comparison between shifting month names and the moon’s renewal does not seem likely.

The next example is reflected in the Greek, but not the Hebrew of Ms B.

ὃς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ

(Joshua) who was made, according to his name,
great for the salvation of his chosen (Sir 46,1).

Here, the play is between the name Joshua (יהושע Ms B) and the word for salvation (חשועה Ms B). In place of the phrase “according to his name”, the Hebrew of Ms B contains the phrase בימיו “in his days”, while the Syriac has another sense. Many scholars agree that the Greek may reflect the original wording, though of course the Hebrew makes just as much sense ³⁹.

The third example of this phrase is found in the Syriac to 2,18 and is only partially paralleled in the Hebrew Ms A, though in the Hebrew the phrase has actually been misplaced to 6,17 ⁴⁰.

mṭl d'yk rbwṭh hkn' rḥmwhy *w'yk šmh hkn' 'bdwhy*

For, as (is) his [i.e., God's] greatness, thus (is) his mercy
and as (is) his name, thus (are) his deeds (Sir 2,18).

ὥς γὰρ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη αὐτοῦ
οὕτως καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ

For, as (is) his majesty
thus (is) his mercy (Sir 2,18).

כִּי כְמוֹהוּ כֵן רֵעֵהוּ כְּשֵׁמוֹ כֵּן מַעֲשָׂיו

For, as (is) a person (lit., he), so (is) his friend,
and like his name, so (are) his deeds (Sir 6,17; Ms A) ⁴¹.

³⁹ Among those scholars who suggest that the original Hebrew to 46,1 contained כְּשֵׁמוֹ are PETERS, *Ecclesiasticus*, 250, 413; SMEND, *Sirach erklärt*, 440; BOX – OESTERLEY, “Sirach”, 490; SEGAL, *Sefer Ben Sira*, 31; SKEHAN – DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 515.

⁴⁰ Those scholars who suggest that the original Hebrew to 2,18 contained the phrase “like his name” include SMEND, *Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch*, 4; BOX – OESTERLEY, “Sirach”, 1.323; SEGAL, *Sefer Ben Sira*, 8; SKEHAN – DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 149; N. CALDUCH-BENAGES, *En el crisol de la prueba. Estudio exegético de Sir 2,1-18* (ABE 32; Estella 1997) 228-229.

⁴¹ Verse 6,17 reads, according to the Greek, “The one who fears the Lord will set straight his friendship, for as (is) a person (lit., he), so (is) his friend”.

The underlying Hebrew phrase to the Syriac version of 2,18 may play on two related nouns, perhaps *מעשה* and the participle of *עשה* in reference to God (as in Psalm 136); perhaps the noun *רחמים* “mercy” and *רחום* “merciful” (as a description of God, as in Deut 4,31); or, perhaps the plural of *גבורה* “mighty works” (in reference to God’s deeds, as in Deut 3,24; Ps 145,4) and *גבור* “warrior” (in reference to God, as in Jer 32,18 and Ps 24,8)⁴². Alternatively (and perhaps more likely), no reference to specific nouns is intended, but the entire complex of associations that apply to God, his name, and his works is evoked. What is being emphasized is not only the relationship between etymologically related words that refer to God and his works, but also the similar ways that these concepts are referred to, for example, as the objects of the verbs “to recount” and “to praise”⁴³.

The final example is clearly in the Hebrew and plays on the associations of etymologically unrelated words. It is perhaps the most striking illustration of how Ben Sira uses ambiguity for expressive purposes, and one that is clearly integral to the verse in which it is found.

כי המוסר כשמה כן הוא ולא לרבים היא נכוחה

For discipline, like its name, so it (is):

it is not obvious to many (Sir 6,22; Ms A).

The pronominal suffix on the word “name”, as well as the second colon’s 3rd person fem. sing. independent pronoun and the fem. sing. adjective agree with the underlying reference in “discipline”, that is, wisdom. The word “discipline” is also referred to with feminine pronouns in Prov 4,13. The 3rd person masc. sing. pronoun in the first colon is perhaps a mistake for *היא*, or, perhaps, it is part of an impersonal phrase, referring to the general idea of the preceding clause, “discipline is like its name”. The vocalization marks on *נכוחה* in Ms A reflect the understanding of the word as a Niphal participle from *יכח* (“be justified”) instead of as the adjective “plain” (as in Prov 8,9)⁴⁴.

A similar sense is supplied in the Syriac, which ends, like the Hebrew: “as (is) his name, so (are) his deeds”.

⁴² For the interpretation of 2,18 as reflecting a play on words from the root *רחם*, see SKEHAN – DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 152.

⁴³ Note *ספר שם* in Ps 102,22; *ספר מעשה* in Ps 107,22; 118,7; *הלל שם* in Ps 69,31; and *שבח מעשה* in Ps 145,4.

⁴⁴ See PETERS, *Ecclesiasticus*, 25.

The Greek suggests understanding the word as “plain”, while the Syriac has a slightly different sense but partially reflects the pointing of נִכְרוּחָה: “Her name is as her teaching and by fools she will not be approved”⁴⁵. The Hebrew text seems to be playing on the two possible ways the consonants מוֹסֵר can be understood, either as “discipline” (a *mem*-preformative noun from the root יָסַר) or as “that which is removed” (a Hophal participle from the root סָר) ⁴⁶. The ambiguity of the word מוֹסֵר is not immediately perceived by the reader/listener of the first colon. The phrase “like its name” hints to the reader that in the next colon another word etymologically related to מוֹסֵר may appear (as in the first two examples cited above), presumably a word from the root יָסַר. The lack of any such word and the reference to discipline not being “obvious” force the reader to reflect on other possible meanings of מוֹסֵר. The ambiguity of the syllables *mūsār*, in effect, helps to demonstrate to the reader what the verse itself is articulating ⁴⁷. And confusion is not limited to the multiple meanings of *mūsār*. The orthography also plays a role in impeding the understanding of the verse. It is possible that a pun is being made not (only) with the Hophal participle of סָר, but also with the similar sounding מוֹסֵר “bond” (*mōsēr*), which word is implied in 6,24 where the Hebrew is not extant (ἐδέη “chain” and κλοιός “collar”) and which is mentioned in Hebrew in 6,30 (מוֹסְרֶיהָ “her bonds”) ⁴⁸. Presumably, such a connection may have encouraged the (mis)pointing of the last word as the Niphal participle of

⁴⁵ CALDUCH-BENAGES et al., *Sabiduría*, 86. For more on this verse, see N. CALDUCH-BENAGES, “A Wordplay on the Term *mūsar* (Sir 6,22)”, *Weisheit als Lebensgrundlage*. Festschrift für Friedrich V. Reiterer zum 65. Geburtstag (eds. R. EGGER-WENZEL, et al.) (DCLS 15; Berlin 2013) 13-26. The fragment of this passage from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which has the masculine form מוֹסֵר [נִכְרוּחָה] (2Q18 at Sir 6,22), is ambiguous.

⁴⁶ For this interpretation, see W. BACHER, “Notes on the Cambridge Fragments of Ecclesiasticus”, *JQR* 12 (1899-1900) 272-290, here 277, and LÉVI, *L’Ecclesiastique*, 2:35.

⁴⁷ See REYMOND, “Wordplay in the Hebrew to Ben Sira”, 42.

⁴⁸ See PETERS, *Ecclesiasticus*, 25; J.J. GLÜCK, “Paronomasia in Biblical Literature”, *Semitics* 1 (1970) 50-78, here 59-60; L. SCHRADER, *Leiden und Gerechtigkeit*. Studien zu Theologie und Textgeschichte des Sirachbuches (Frankfurt am Main 1994) 167; and N. SEGER, “L’Utilisation de la polysémie des racines hébraïques chez Ben Sira” (unpublished Ph.D. diss.; Strasbourg 2005) 87-96.

יִכָּח “she/it is not right/justified by many”, which reflects the assertion that a bond is not something that many people would find justifiable. Note also that the characterization of Wisdom in this verse is echoed in Sir 4,17-18, which describes how Wisdom disguises herself in order to test her disciples, before revealing her true identity to them.

The four examples of passages containing or reflecting the Hebrew equivalent to “like its name” demonstrate that Ben Sira appreciates links between etymologically and/or phonetically similar words; furthermore, it is clear that he finds it important to highlight these links. The obvious way that Ben Sira does this is not found in other wisdom texts. (In the Bible, the phrase “like its name” appears clearly in a similar kind of wordplay only in relation to Nabal [1 Sam 25,25])⁴⁹. In particular, the first two examples (Sir 43,8 and 46,1) demonstrate a consciousness of a common meaning between different words, while the last two examples (from Sir 2,18 and 6,22) provoke the reader to find such connections on their own, in part by providing an enigmatic text that can be interpreted in multiple ways.

VI. Conclusion: Ben Sira and the Ambiguity of Language

The preceding pages have demonstrated that Ben Sira was cognizant of the imprecision inherent in human communication. Specifically, Ben Sira seeks to explicitly warn his readers of the flexibility of meaning due to shifting contexts. If the same words are uttered by different people and/or at different times, their import can be quite distinct. This, in general, fits in with the implicit recognition elsewhere in Sirach that humans hold different biases, opinions, and perspectives. Ben Sira also wishes to communicate to his readers the variety of ways that words can have different meanings due to their phonology, morphology, and syntax. He does not offer specific warnings in relation to these factors but communicates this dimension of language variability through example. The idea that he would want to highlight these dimensions of language to his students is suggested by the emphasis he places on his students study-

⁴⁹ A similar phrase (כְּשִׁמְךָ) also appears in Ps 48,11a, though it is likely not part of a similar comparison.

ing riddles and being linguistically dextrous, the explicit ways he cites some examples of wordplay (“like its name”), as well as his intention of complicating certain concepts (like “glory” and “shame”) that his readers would have taken for granted. Tellingly, imprecision of language continued to be a topic associated with the Wisdom of Ben Sira even after its author’s death. In the preface to his translation, Ben Sira’s grandson implies that he has been unable to accurately communicate certain ideas/phrases of his grandfather’s Hebrew in his Greek translation: “For that which is said in Hebrew, when translated into another language, does not have the same sense (ἰσοδυναμεῖ)” (Sir Prologue 21-22).

Yale Divinity School
409 Prospect St.
New Haven, CT 06511 (USA)

Eric D. REYMOND

SUMMARY

This article explores the problems posed by language due to its imprecision, the disparity between what one says (or means to say) and what is interpreted. Ben Sira warns his readers of the dangers posed by the changing contexts of an utterance. Sensitivity to context reflects other aspects of Ben Sira’s teaching, such as his awareness of people’s differing perspectives. In addition, Ben Sira is concerned that his readers be aware of the multiple meanings behind words due to the polysemous nature of the words themselves, their morphology, and/or how they are used.

Dying with Power

Mark 15,39 from Ancient to Modern Interpretation

The Gospel of Mark is punctuated by a series of pivotal moments in which Jesus is called the son of God, beginning with Jesus' baptism when the voice from heaven tells him, "you are my son, the beloved" (1,11) ¹. The scope widens at the Transfiguration when the voice from the cloud declares to all who were present, "This is my beloved son. Listen to him!" (9,7). The third and final confession comes, not from the mouth of God, but from the centurion who was standing opposite Jesus as he died: ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.

While it is clear that the centurion's remark is a climactic moment in the Gospel, its precise significance is obscured by three related ambiguities. First, the centurion is said to make this remark because he saw the way Jesus died: "Seeing that thus he expired, he said ..." (ἰδὼν... ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν). There is no indication that the centurion saw the temple curtain rip. Why would the manner of Jesus' death as described by Mark inspire such a comment?

The second ambiguity is the meaning of υἱὸς θεοῦ. According to Colwell's rule, a predicate nominative which precedes a copulative verb may be definite even if it is anarthrous, so a possible translation would be "the son of God" ². On the other hand, "a son of God" or even "a son of a god" remain possible construals ³. Moreover, the use of the past tense (ἦν) would seem to indicate that the centu-

¹ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. Mark may also call Jesus the son of God in the superscription (1,1), but these words are missing from a number of early and weighty manuscripts (e.g., \aleph^* Θ sa^{ms}). B.D. EHRMAN (*The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* [New York 1993] 72-75) has argued that transcriptional evidence favors the shorter reading because scribes are unlikely to have omitted these words intentionally, or — in the very first line of the Gospel — unintentionally, but T. WASSERMAN ("The 'Son of God' Was in the Beginning (Mark 1:1)", *JTS* 62 [2011] 20-50) has shown that accidental omission in the opening of a book is a possibility.

² "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament", *JBL* 52 (1933) 12-21.

³ E.g., A. PLUMMER (*The Gospel according to St. Mark* [Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge 1914; repr., Grand Rapids, MI

rion's remark is something less than a full Christian confession. It is unclear, therefore, whether the centurion refers to Jesus as the unique son of God, consonant with the baptism and transfiguration, or if he is merely calling Jesus a divine son.

The third and culminating ambiguity is the very tone and meaning of the centurion's remark. I have avoided referring to the centurion's words as a confession, for it is not clear that the centurion is confessing anything other than scorn for Jesus. Perhaps the centurion's remark should be read as gallows humor which mocks the pretentious claims of the crucified corpse before him: "Truly, this man was a son of God"⁴.

These three interpretive difficulties impinge on each other, and any proposed solution for one must be able to account for the others. In part I of this paper, I shall attempt to illuminate the complexities of Mark 15:39 by surveying ancient, medieval, and modern attempts to make sense of this verse. In part II, I shall defend a modern interpretation that seeks to incorporate the best insights of prior interpretations while avoiding their weaknesses.

I. *Wirkungsgeschichte*

1. *Other Gospels*

The Matthean passion narrative eliminates or lessens all three of the ambiguities identified in the Markan version. In Matt. 27:54 the centurion is impressed, not by the way Jesus expired, but by an

1982] 361) writes: "The centurion, no doubt, meant far less than the truth when he called Jesus 'a son of God.' But at least he meant that he had never seen a better man die a nobler death".

⁴ A "sarcastic" reading of 15:39 has found a number of recent defenders, including D.H. JUEL, *A Master of Surprise. Mark Interpreted* (Minneapolis, MN 1994) 74; ID., *Mark* (ACNT; Minneapolis, MN 1990) 227; ID., *An Introduction to New Testament Literature* (Nashville, TN 1978) 146. Here Juel maintains that the centurion thought Jesus was innocent (i.e., υἱὸς θεοῦ = a good man). S. DOWD, *Reading Mark. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel* (Macon, GA 2000) 162; R.A. HORSLEY, *Hearing the Whole Story. The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville, KY 2001) 252; T. J. GEDDERT, *Mark* (Believers Church Bible Commentary; Scottdale, PA 2001) 381; M. GOODACRE, *The Case Against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA 2002) 160.

earthquake and “the things that happened” (τὰ γενόμενα) ⁵. In both Mark and Matthew the temple curtain rips, but Mark gives no indication that the centurion could see this, and if he was at all aware of the topography of Jerusalem he would have known that the centurion could not have seen it. Indeed, as noted above, Mark explicitly states that the centurion made his remark upon seeing Jesus expire. Matthew resolves this ambiguity by adding the words τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα and by having those who were with the centurion join him in his confession; the centurion saw not simply a death but an earthquake and other remarkable things, all of which led him and the other soldiers to confess that Jesus was the son of God. Matthew’s version of the “confession” itself changes υἱὸς θεοῦ to θεοῦ υἱός, increasing the emphasis on God. Moreover, unlike the Markan version, there can be no doubt that the confession is sincere, for Matthew informs us that it was spoken in great fear (ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα) ⁶.

Interestingly, Luke’s redaction of Mark 15,39 matches Matthew’s point by point. Like Matthew, Luke does away with Mark’s odd rationale for the centurion’s remark, making “what had happened” (τὸ γενόμενον) the impetus for his confession. Similarly, just as Matthew increased the objective grandeur of Jesus’ death by depicting those who were with the centurion joining him in his confession, Luke mentions that all the crowds who had gathered to see Jesus die returned home in sorrow, beating their breasts (Luke 23,48). Luke also eliminates the ambiguous expression υἱὸς θεοῦ, replacing it with δίκαιος, and, like Matthew, clarifies the intent of the centurion’s remark by explaining that the centurion “glorified God saying, ‘Truly this man was just’” ⁷.

The Gospel of Peter shows some of the same concerns as Matthew and Luke but offers a much more radical solution. To be sure, we cannot be certain that the Gospel of Peter was interpreting Mark at all ⁸. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that, like Matthew

⁵ B D 33 *pc* have the present tense τὰ γινόμενα.

⁶ This argument presumes Markan priority, but it does not depend on it. If one were to argue that Mark used Matthew as a source it would make Mark’s ambiguities even more striking.

⁷ This forms the climax of the emphasis on Jesus’ innocence throughout the Lukan passion narrative. See 23,4.14-15.22.41.

⁸ Note, however, that Peter, like Mark, uses the Latin κεντυρίων rather than ἑκατόνταρχος like Matthew and Luke. Also, the centurion’s confession

and Luke, Peter finds a more spectacular impetus for the centurion’s confession. For Peter it is the resurrection itself that forces the centurion and his soldiers to believe Jesus was the son of God. Also, just as Matthew mentions that the centurion and those with him “feared greatly” and Luke depicts him “glorifying God”, Peter leaves no doubt whether the confession was sincere, describing the centurion and those with him “agonizing greatly” (ἀγωνιῶντες μεγάλως) when they make their confession.

The tendency of later gospels to clarify the tone of the centurion’s remark can be seen easily in synopsis:

Matt 27,54	Mark 15,39	Luke 23,47-48	Peter 45 (after Jesus’ resurrection)
<p>Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμόν καὶ τὰ γινόμενα</p> <p>ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες· ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος.</p>	<p>ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν·</p> <p>ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.</p>	<p>ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γινόμενον</p> <p>ἐδόξασεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων· ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν. καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγινόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρήσαντες τὰ γινόμενα, τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον.</p>	<p>Ταῦτα ἰδόντες οἱ περὶ τὸν κεντυρίωνα νυκτὸς ἔσπευσαν πρὸς Πιλάτου ἀφέντες τὸν τάφον ὃν ἐφύλασσαν καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο πάντα ἅπερ εἶδον ἀγωνιῶντες μεγάλως καὶ λέγοντες ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ.</p>
<p>Matt 27,54</p> <p>The centurion and those with him guarding Jesus seeing the earthquake and the things that happened</p> <p>feared greatly saying, “Truly this was God’s Son!”</p>	<p>Mark 15,39</p> <p>The centurion who stood facing him seeing how he breathed his last said,</p> <p>“Truly this man was the son of God”.</p>	<p>Luke 23,47-48</p> <p>The centurion seeing what happened</p> <p>glorified God saying, “Certainly this man was innocent!” And all the crowds who had gathered for this spectacle seeing the things that happened returned home beating their breasts.</p>	<p>Peter 45 (after Jesus’ resurrection)</p> <p>Those who were with the centurion seeing these things hurried in the night to Pilate, leaving the tomb they guarded, and explained all the things they saw, agonizing greatly and saying, “Truly this was the son of God!”</p>

in Peter (ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ) is identical to the Markan confession as found in A C W et al.

As the underlined portions show, Matthew, Luke, and Peter all add the following elements: 1) something more impressive than Jesus' dying breath to provoke a confession; 2) additional witnesses who, like the centurion, were led to make a confession; 3) explanatory phrases that determine the tone of the centurion's words.

2. Copyists of Mark

Unlike the authors of Matthew, Luke, and Peter, copyists of Mark were not at liberty to create an entirely new gospel. Interestingly, however, the manuscript evidence evinces discomfort with the very features of Mark that were altered by later passion narratives. Here is a sample of the most relevant readings. Note both how the centurion is described *vis-à-vis* Jesus and what prompts his confession.

<p>Vaticanus (B) = NA²⁸</p> <p>ιδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν εἶπεν· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.</p>	<p>When the centurion who stood facing him saw how he breathed his last he said, "Truly this man was the son of God".</p>
<p>Bezae (D)</p> <p>ιδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐκ[= ἐκεῖ] οὕτως αὐτὸν κράζαντα καὶ ἐξέπνευσεν ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν.</p>	<p>When the centurion who stood <u>there</u> saw <u>how he cried out and breathed his last</u> [he said,] "Truly this man was God's son".</p>
<p>Freerianus (W)</p> <p>ιδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων παρεστὼς αὐτῷ ὅτι <u>κράζας</u>⁹ ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν, ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ.</p>	<p>When the centurion who stood <u>with him</u> saw <u>that he breathed his last while crying out</u> he said, "Truly this man was the son of God".</p>
<p>Bobbiensis (k)</p> <p>Videns autem centurio qui ex adverso stabat quia <u>sic exclamavit</u> ait vere homo hic Filius Dei erat.</p>	<p>When the centurion who was standing facing him saw <u>how he cried out</u> he said, "Truly this man was the son of God".</p>
<p>Clementine Vulgate</p> <p>Videns autem centurio qui ex adverso stabat quia <u>sic clamans exspirasset</u> ait vere homo hic Filius Dei erat.</p>	<p>When the centurion who was standing facing him saw <u>how he had breathed his last while crying out</u> he said, "Truly this man was the son of God".</p>
<p>Alexandrinus = TR</p> <p>ιδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως <u>κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν</u>, εἶπεν, ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ.</p>	<p>When the centurion who was standing facing him saw <u>how he breathed his last while crying out</u> he said, "Truly this man was the son of God".</p>

⁹ Cf. Matt 27,50.

Note that, like Matthew, Codex Bezae lessens the ambiguity of the centurion's remark by putting "God" front and center. Yet, this change could be the result of synoptic harmonization and is, therefore, not of itself convincing. More impressive is the attempt in Bezae and Freerianus to clarify the centurion's feelings about Jesus by eliminating ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ. The word ἐναντίος can signify hostility, and both Matthew and Luke omit it ¹⁰. Bezae removes any hint of animosity by describing the centurion simply standing "there" (ἐκεῖ) ¹¹. Freerianus goes a step further, replacing ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ with αὐτῷ, which could be translated "the centurion who stood with him", suggesting that the centurion was actually standing in solidarity with Jesus ¹².

The most conspicuous changes in these manuscripts concern what it was that prompted the centurion's confession. All the manuscripts cited above, with the exception of Vaticanus, clarify Mark's ἰδὼν ... ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν by drawing attention to the fact that Jesus had cried out. Freerianus, for instance, says "When the centurion who stood with him saw that he breathed his last while crying out, he said ...". This change, while subtle, makes a decisive difference. The centurion's remark is no longer prompted simply by the manner of Jesus' expiration, but by something more specific, namely, the fact that he died while (or "after") crying out. The old Latin Bobbiensis goes so far as to leave no mention of Jesus' death, saying that the centurion was moved to confess him to be the son of God when he saw that *sic exclamavit*. Similarly, Bezae, Alexandrinus, the Vulgate — as well as many other manuscripts and versions — all introduce corruptions that draw attention to the fact that

¹⁰ C. MYERS, *Binding the Strong Man*. A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus (Maryknoll, NY 1988) 393. E.g., instances in which ἐξ ἐναντίας clearly describes opposition: 2 Sam 18,13; Obad 1,11; Dan 10,13 (Theod.) "The ruler of the kingdom of Persia opposed me (ἐξ ἐναντίας μου)"; Titus 2,8; Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.225. Frequently ἐξ ἐναντίας describes soldiers lining up against each other for battle, e.g., 2 Sam 10,10, "They were lined up for battle against the sons of Ammon (ἐξ ἐναντίας υἱῶν Αμμων)"; 1 Sam 17,2; 17,8; 1 Kgs 22,35; Ps 34,3. For instances without ἐκ, see, e.g., Acts 26,9; 1 Thess 2,15. Pace K. IVERSON, "A Centurion's 'Confession': A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39", *JBL* 130 (2011) 329-350.

¹¹ See the same reading in Θ 565 i n q.

¹² See the same reading in f¹ 2542 sy^{s,p}. Cf. similar uses of the dative in 2 Cor 6,14; Jas 2,22.

Jesus cried out as he was dying¹³. As a result, church people and scholars before the time of Westcott and Hort were largely unaware of the reading which is found in Vaticanus¹⁴.

The most striking feature of this collection of variants is the fact that, while all the corruptions seek to draw attention to Jesus' cry, they are found in every text type except the Alexandrian and they alter the text using different wording. It appears, therefore, that numerous copyists and translators independently sought to "fix" the centurion's confession by drawing attention to Jesus' cry. Taken together with Matthew and Luke's redaction of Mark, this is strong evidence that Mark's earliest readers found 15,39 problematic. Why would the anguished cry of a crucified man lead a Roman centurion to see him as the son of God? Matthew, Luke, and ancient copyists resolve this inconcinnity by shifting the centurion's gaze to something magnificent.

The widespread early Christian discomfort with Mark 15,39 raises another question: why were so many copyists and translators convinced that the "great cry" in 15,37 was the impetus for the confession? A less complicated solution would have been to borrow τὰ γινόμενα/τὸ γινόμενον from Matthew and Luke, indicating that the remarkable phenomena surrounding Jesus' crucifixion prompted the centurion's confession. We turn now to evidence suggesting that Jesus' dying yell was an important theological datum for patristic and medieval commentators, a fact which may explain why numerous scribes independently made the centurion marvel at one who died "while crying out".

¹³ E.g., see the apparatus of the NA²⁸.

¹⁴ See the Wycliffite Bible: "But the centurien that stood forn ayens siy, that he so crynge hadde diede, and seide, Verili, this man was Goddis sone". The Douay-Rheims: "And the centurion who stood over against him, seeing that crying out in this manner he had given up the ghost, said: Indeed this man was the son of God". The KJV: "And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God".

3. *Patristic and Medieval Interpretations*

In a homily on Matthew, John Chrysostom (c. 347-407), who wrote shortly before Bezae, Freerianus, and Bobbiensis were created, uses John 10,18 to interpret Jesus' dying cry as a display of power:

And Jesus, when he had cried with a loud voice, gave up his spirit. This is what he said, "I have power (ἐξουσίαν) to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again, and I lay it down of myself" [John 10,18]. For on account of this he cried with the voice, that it might be shown that the act is done by power (κατ' ἐξουσίαν). Mark at any rate says that "Pilate marveled that he was already dead" and [Mark says] that the centurion believed for this reason above all, because he died with power [Mark 15,44.39] ¹⁵.

Chrysostom uses John 10,18 to interpret Mark precisely the way that many scribes did: it was the miracle of Jesus' dying cry that brought the centurion to belief ¹⁶.

Variations on this interpretation were common. Chrysostom's contemporary, Ambrose (337-397), wrote that when Jesus gave up his spirit (*emisit spiritum*) it indicated that he willingly gave up his life: "For that which is sent (*emittitur*) is voluntary, but that which is lost (*amittitur*) is necessary" ¹⁷. Slightly later, Augustine describes Jesus' dying yell and speedy death as a miracle that amazed the onlookers:

"I have power to lay down my life ... [John 10,18]." And as the Gospel says, it greatly amazed those who were present when, after that cry in which he set forth a figure of sin, he immediately gave up his spirit. Those who are hung on the cross were tortured with a prolonged death. Whence the legs of the thieves were broken so that they would die and be taken down from the cross before the Sabbath. But it was a marvel that Jesus was found [already] dead ¹⁸.

Here again we see the link to John 10,18. In his omnipotence Jesus performed a miracle in his final moments by thwarting the agonizing dilatory death of crucifixion.

¹⁵ *Hom. Matt.* 58.776.

¹⁶ Chrysostom goes on to add that it was Jesus' final scream that tore the temple curtain and opened the tombs (*ibid.*).

¹⁷ *Exp. Luc.* 10.1186.

¹⁸ *Trin.* 4.13.

In the 8th century the English monk Bede wrote that, “The cause of the centurion’s wonder is clear because seeing the Lord thus expire, that is, send forth his spirit (*spiritum emisisse*) he said: ‘Truly this man was the son of God.’ For no one has the power to send forth the spirit (*emittendi spiritum*) except the creator of souls”¹⁹. Paschasius Radbertus (785-865) specifically contrasts the Markan version with Matthew’s: “For Mark did not say what Matthew said, namely, that ‘the centurion saw the earthquake and the things that were done,’ but only that ‘thus crying out, he expired.’ Whence the centurion understood something great in the yell and also in that he released his spirit”²⁰. Thomas Aquinas argued that, “In order for Christ to show that the passion inflicted by violence was not taking away his life, he conserved his natural bodily strength, so that at the last moment he was able to cry out in a loud voice, that his death is counted among his miracles. Hence it is written... [Mark 15,39]”²¹. Similar interpretations are common in medieval and early modern commentators²².

The longstanding tradition of making sense of the centurion’s remark by investing Jesus’ yell with great import is doubly significant. It demonstrates, first of all, that careful attention to the way Mark’s words run leads one into a corner: if the centurion confessed belief in Jesus because of the way Jesus expired then there must have been something exceptional about his dying breath. As

¹⁹ *In Marci euangelium expositio*, 4.15.

²⁰ *Expositio in Mattheo*, 12.4264.

²¹ *Summa theologiae*, III.47.1.

²² E.g., Theophylact’s commentary on Mark (11th century): “When the centurion ... saw how Jesus as Master of life gave up His life, he marveled and confessed Him” (*The Explanation by Blessed Theophylact Archbishop of Ochrid and Bulgaria of the Holy Gospel according to St. Mark* [House Springs, MO 1993] 137); Bernard of Clairvaux (*Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, 28.4); the *Glossa ordinaria* on Mark 15,39; Cornelius à Lapide (d. 1637) connects Mark 15:39 to John 10:18. After explaining the latter, he writes: “hence Christ on the Cross cried aloud and gave up the ghost to show that He died without compulsion, and of His own accord, when He might, had He so willed, have lived on. For He who had strength to cry aloud, had strength also to live, so that the centurion beholding this said, ‘Truly this was the Son of God’”. *S. John’s Gospel — Chapters 1 to 11* (trans. T.W. MOSSMAN; vol. 5 of *The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide*; Edinburgh 1908) 372-73; M. HENRY, *Comprehensive Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Brattleboro, VT 1834) 395.

Paschasius Radbertus put it, “the centurion understood something great in the yell”. Second, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine were defending this interpretation around the same time that the creators of Bezae and other manuscripts were drawing attention to Jesus’ dying yell. This suggests that the scribes who introduced these corruptions were indeed attempting, like Matthew, Luke, and Peter before them, to explain how the centurion could have come to believe Jesus was the son of God ²³.

4. *Modern Interpreters*

Modern interpreters have, by and large, perpetuated the long-standing tendency to attempt to find something fantastic in the manner of Jesus’ death. For example, Wrede avers that “Markus muss hier meinen, dass der Hauptmann etwas Wunderbares wahrnahm, das ihn zu seinem Bekenntnis zwang. Die Art und Weise des Sterbens überwältigt ihn. Der Erzähler kann dabei — nach bekannter Auslegung — nur an den lauten Schrei des Sterbenden gedacht haben oder an das Zerreißen des Tempelvorhangs” ²⁴. Many recent commentators, such as Raymond Brown, Joel Marcus, and PHEME PERKINS, favor the idea that the centurion saw the rending of the temple curtain ²⁵.

Others, such as Gundry, emphasize the importance of Jesus’ dying yell ²⁶. Hans-Christian Kammler recently defended this reading with no less conviction than patristic and medieval commentators. According to Kammler, Jesus’ dying cry was not an inarticulate cry of a dying man. Rather, it showed “daß Jesus in seiner Passion

²³ In light of this evidence it is interesting to note that Matt 27,50 portrays Jesus giving up his spirit (ἄφηκεν τὸ πνεῦμα) and in Luke 23,46 Jesus quotes Ps 31,5 while handing over his spirit to God (πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθειμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου). Luke moves in the direction of depicting Jesus laying down his own life, and Matthew may be suggesting the same.

²⁴ W. WREDE, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums (Göttingen 1963) 76.

²⁵ R. BROWN, *Death of the Messiah* (New York 1994) II, 1145; J. MARCUS, *Mark 8–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27a; New Haven, CT 2009) 1057–1058; P. PERKINS, “The Gospel of Mark”, *The New Interpreter’s Bible* 8 (Nashville, TN 1995) 724.

²⁶ M. GUNDRY, *Mark. A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI 1993) 973.

bis zum allerletzten Augenblick der Handelnde ist, daß er mithin vom Tod nicht überwältigt wird, sondern sein Leben freiwillig in den Tod dahingibt”²⁷. It was this display of power that led the centurion to understand that Jesus was God’s son: “Denn aus der Parallelität der Worte ἀφείλς φωνήν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν V. 37 und οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν V. 39 ist zu folgern, daß der römische Centurio in dem Gekreuzigten gerade deshalb den ‘Gottessohn’ erkennt, weil er ihn unmittelbar zuvor so — nämlich mit einem ‘lauten Schrei’ — sterben sah”²⁸. Kammler is surely correct to suppose that the parallelism between v. 37 and v. 39 is relevant for understanding what provoked the centurion’s remark, but it is less clear that the Markan Jesus’ dying breath manifested his equanimity and power. As Adela Collins recently put it, Mark describes Jesus’ death as “anguished, human, and realistic”²⁹. It is interesting to note that, unlike most pre-modern commentators, Kammler, Gundry and others who defend this reading are not interpreting a text which explicitly mentions the cry as that which most impressed the centurion. In other words, pre-modern readers argued that the centurion was impressed with the cry in part because their text actually said, “When the centurion who was standing with him saw that he expired while crying out, he said ...”. Modern readers have no such justification.

On the whole, modern attempts to make sense of Mark 15,39 are among the most fanciful in history. Frederick W. Danker, for example, argues that it is the sight of a demon leaving Jesus’ body that compels his confession: “Mark’s literary technique therefore clearly indicates that he does not mean to imply that the centurion was aware of the rending of the veil. The soldier’s pronouncement is not based on that sign, but on the cry. The expulsion of the demon is what the centurion ‘observed’ (ἰδών)”³⁰. Danker is not

²⁷ C. KAMMLER “Das Verständnis der Passion Jesu im Markusevangelium”, *ZThK* 103 (2006) 461-491, 485.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 486.

²⁹ A. COLLINS “Mark’s Interpretation of the Death of Jesus”, *JBL* 128 (2009) 545-554, here 553-554.

³⁰ F. DANKER, “The Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction”, *ZNW* 61 (1970) 48-69, here 69. K. Stock (“Das Bekenntnis des Centurio. Mk 15,39 im Rahmen des Markusevangeliums”, *ZKT* 100 [1978] 289-301) suggests that Jesus’ cry recalls divine cries in the OT (e.g., Amos 1,2) and that this is what led the centurion to his confession.

alone in discerning hints of demonic activity in Mark's passion narrative³¹. Yet, if Mark had wanted to suggest that the centurion believed in Jesus because he saw a demon leave Jesus' body, one would expect him both to indicate that this was what the centurion saw and to explain why this would lead him to say Jesus was υἱὸς θεοῦ³². To be fair, Danker does go on to say that Mark does not imply "awareness on the part of the centurion of the demonic dimension of the proceedings," claiming that "The centurion's response is in fact Mark's own clarification"³³. Yet, Danker here creates more problems than he solves by confusing the story level (i.e., the characters and events within the narrative) with the discourse level (i.e., the effect of the narrative on the readers)³⁴. The centurion's remark may indeed clarify things for the reader, but that does not explain why, according to Mark's narrative, the centurion made this remark.

To sum up part I: the earliest interpreters of Mark had the freedom to change Mark's text, which makes the early gospels and textual variants a record, not only of what these people thought Mark was saying, but also of what they thought he ought to have said. We have seen two very clear tendencies in these interpreter-redactors. 1) Both gospels and scribes take pains to clarify the centurion's feelings about Jesus. The gospels do this by adding explanatory phrases (Matt: "fearing greatly"; Luke: "glorifying God"; Peter: "agonizing greatly"), whereas scribes of Mark made the centurion stand "there" (ἐκεῖ) at the cross, or "with him" (αὐτῷ) rather than "against him" (ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ). 2) Both gospels and scribes provide something spectacular to prompt the centurion's remark. Matthew adds an earthquake; both Matthew and Luke claim it was all "that had happened" that prompted the centurion's confession.

³¹ E.g., J. MARCUS, "Identity and Ambiguity in Markan Christology", *Seeking the Identity of Jesus* (eds. R.B. HAYS – B.R. GAVENTA) (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 133-147.

³² Brown (*Death of the Messiah*, II, 1144) comments, "[E]ven if one were to accept [Danker's] theory, such a defeat of the forces of evil might cause the centurion to exclaim that Jesus was good or innocent, but why would it lead him to give to Jesus the highest christological evaluation in the Gospel?"

³³ DANKER, "The Demonic Secret", 69.

³⁴ I borrow the story/discourse distinction from R. FOWLER, *Let the Reader Understand. Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Harrisburg, PA 1996) 2.

In the Gospel of Peter the centurion sees the risen Jesus striding forth from the tomb before he makes his confession. Similarly, manuscripts of every text type apart from the Alexandrian say that the centurion saw Jesus die while giving a great shout.

Rather than rewriting the text, patristic, medieval, and modern commentators have sought to find an explanation for the centurion's belief³⁵. Until the advent of modern textual criticism, most texts indicated that it was in fact Jesus' dying yell that impressed the centurion; so it is not surprising that most pre-modern commentators have read Mark accordingly. Interestingly, many modern exegeses have persisted in assuming the centurion saw something magnificent, either Jesus' dying yell, the rending of the temple curtain, or even a demon flying out of Jesus.

All of these interpretations, however, have significant weaknesses. I have already noted the problems with Danker's exorcism theory. The miraculous yell theory has in its favor the fact that Mark draws our attention to Jesus' dying breath: οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν in v. 39 pellucidly refers back to ἐξέπνευσεν in v. 37, and this could include the "great shout" that Jesus released as he died. Nevertheless, this theory seems to be based more on Johannine notions of Jesus' equanimity and power than on a careful reading of Mark. Those who argue that the centurion witnessed the rending of the temple curtain claim that Mark may not have been familiar with Jerusalem's topography, while ignoring the fact that Mark gives no indication the centurion saw any such thing. Rather, as just noted, Mark draws our attention to Jesus' dying breath. But how could Jesus' dying breath prompt the centurion's response if not by its miraculous strength³⁶?

³⁵ This description introduces a somewhat artificial distinction between ancient copyists and interpreters of Mark. I retain this language for the sake of convenience, but, as this very discussion shows, the tasks of copying and interpreting Mark were intertwined.

³⁶ One might argue that the darkness is supposed to convince the centurion that Jesus was a son of a god. It would have been seen by everyone and could be plausibly included as part of how Jesus died. Nevertheless, the flow of 15,33-39 weighs against this reading. Confusion and mockery surround Jesus even after the three hours of darkness (see vv. 35-36).

II. The Centurion Who Stood Against Him

In recent years a number of scholars have suggested that the centurion's cry should be taken as a sarcastic comment much like the soldiers' mocking acclamation "Hail, King of the Jews" (15,18). Donald Juel writes,

Though [a true confession] is possible, in view of the rest of the narrative it is unlikely... Elsewhere in the narrative, the role of Jesus' enemies, Jews and Romans alike, is to speak the truth without understanding what they say. 'You are the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' says the high priest. 'You are the King of the Jews?' asks Pilate. 'Hail, King of the Jews,' the soldiers taunt. 'So, you are the Christ, the King of Israel, are you?' say the bystanders at the cross. It would seem more appropriate to read the statement of the centurion in such light ³⁷.

Perhaps the centuries of exegetical confusion surrounding 15,39 are an indication that interpreters have been forcing the centurion to speak for them. That is, perhaps readers have heard their own confession in the centurion's words. Instead of being the first person to understand that the crucified Jesus is the Son of God, perhaps the centurion is, like the other bystanders in the narrative, mocking Jesus' divine pretensions, even while — in a classic instance of Markan irony — the readers understand that Jesus is in fact the Son of God.

In his recent commentary, Joel Marcus marshals three arguments against the sarcastic reading of the centurion. First, Marcus argues that "the linkage that the narrative forges between him and the watching women" suggests the centurion is, like the women, sympathetic to Jesus: "The story places the centurion alongside the women after Jesus' death, not alongside the mockers before that event" ³⁸. Yet, the centurion is not "alongside" the women at all. Rather, the centurion is standing near the cross along with Jesus' mockers while the women are "looking on from afar" (15,40). The only narrative link between the centurion and the women is the fact that they are mentioned after Jesus' death.

Marcus' other objections are weightier: "With regard to the messianic secret, its disclosure at Jesus' death is consonant with Markan

³⁷ JUEL, *Mark*, 227-228.

³⁸ MARCUS, *Mark* 8-16, 1059.

Christology: now that Jesus' messiahship and divine sonship have been decisively qualified by his crucifixion, it is appropriate for them to be revealed"³⁹. Marcus also notes that,

[T]he centurion's confession is one of three architectonic acclamations of Jesus as the Son of God, which are similar in form and seem to structure the whole Gospel, appearing significantly at its beginning, middle, and end; since the other two (1:11; 9:7) come from the mouth of God, it makes sense that the third is revelatory as well⁴⁰.

In other words, given Mark's concern to depict Jesus as one who can be understood as Messiah only at the foot of the cross, how could the centurion's confession be anything less than revelatory, especially when Mark seems to have structured the entire Gospel around these three pivotal confessions? Given these considerations it hardly seems possible that the centurion's remark is merely another indication of the cruelty of Jesus' killers.

Marcus is surely correct to suppose 15:39 is a revelatory moment in the Gospel. But revelatory for whom? Throughout Mark's passion narrative Jesus' enemies sarcastically laud him as king, even while Mark's readers know that these jibes are actually true. To borrow Robert M. Fowler's distinction once again, at the story level Jesus is mocked as a royal pretender, but at the discourse level Mark is claiming that Jesus is in fact a king. Fowler writes,

When readers argue that 15:39 is a grand denouement, they are reflecting their own reading experience and their own response to the narrative's discourse. Both what the centurion says (his locution) and what he intends to accomplish by saying it (his intended illocution) remain ambiguous at story level. At discourse level, however, no reader of Mark's Gospel has failed to grasp that the wording of the centurion's utterance can be picked up and used as an appropriate summary of the narrator's own understanding of Jesus⁴¹.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ FOWLER, *Let the Reader Understand*, 208. Fowler argues that 15:39 remains ambiguous regardless of one's preferred interpretation and cautions against any attempt at resolution "because we can thereby forfeit the very reading experience the author offers us" (208-209). See also the similar arguments of W.T. SHINER, "The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion

Marcus's interpretation conflates the story and the discourse level, assuming that if the centurion's words are revelatory, then we must read them as a sincere confession. But Mark's entire passion narrative is driven by the awful tension between the words and deeds of the antagonists and the full meaning of those words and deeds which are clear only to the readers⁴². On the story level Jesus is mocked and crowned as a messianic pretender even while readers see in this mockery an actual crowning. The conventional term for the palpable tension between these two levels is irony.

A summary of some of the most salient contrasts between the story and discourse levels may illuminate the point. In 14,61 the high priest scornfully asks Jesus if he is the Christ ("Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"). Similarly, in 15,2 Pilate says "Are you the King of the Jews?". Readers of Mark know that Jesus had connected his messiahship to his suffering, for after Peter confessed him to be the Christ, Jesus told his disciples that the Son of Man must suffer much (8,27-33; cf. 14,3-9). Thus, the jeering messianic titles heaped on Jesus by the high priest, Pilate, the titulus (15,26), and those witnessing the crucifixion (15,29-32) are for the reader confirmations of Jesus' messiahship. Indeed, Jesus gives a hint that this is the case when he replies to Pilate's mocking question, "You say so" (15,2). In other words, Jesus' persecutors are unwittingly hailing him as the true king of the Jews⁴³.

and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark", *JSNT* 78 (2000) 3-22 and E.S. JOHNSON, JR., "Mark 15,39 and the So-Called Confession of the Roman Centurion", *Bib* 81 (2000) 406-413.

⁴² Marcus's own research illuminates the origins of this interpretation of Jesus' death. In a *JBL* article ("Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation", *JBL* 125 [2006] 73-87), Marcus shows that the Romans had a penchant for creatively talionic punishments, and that crucifixion was intended to mock the political arrogance of the victim. Occasionally, if the victim responded with surprising courage or dignity, the mockery could be seen to point to the eminence of the victim. Marcus concludes his essay by suggesting, "for many early Christians, this reversal of a reversal, which turned penal mockery on its head, was probably the inner meaning of Jesus' crucifixion" (87). If the Gospel of Mark is any indication, Jesus did not display surprising courage when he died. Nevertheless, it seems likely that the earliest Christians would have interpreted the mockeries of Jesus' pretensions as literal statements of his greatness, thereby beginning the message of "Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles" (1 Cor 1,23).

⁴³ MARCUS, "Parodic Exaltation", 87.

Another striking example appears when members of the Sanhedrin, while spitting on and striking Jesus, demand that he prophesy for them (14,65). At the story level we see Jesus being mocked for claiming to be the Christ. But at the discourse level it is clear the soldiers themselves are at that moment unknowingly fulfilling Jesus' prophecies that he would be mocked and spit upon by the leaders of the people (10,33-34; cf. also 8,31; 9,12, 31). Then, in the very next verse, Mark turns to the fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy that Peter would deny him three times (14,66-72; cf. 14,30). Thus, the Sanhedrin proves Jesus to be a prophet by mocking him as a false prophet.

The ironic tension between story and discourse continues when an entire cohort of soldiers gathers together, dresses Jesus in purple, gives him a crown, hails him as king, and genuflects before him (15,16-20). Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386) noted the contrast between the intentions of the soldiers and the flow of the narrative:

The soldiers crowding around mock him, and the Lord becomes a sport to them, and the master is mocked. "They see me, they wag their heads" [Ps 109,25]. Yet the figure of kingly dignity appears. For though they mock, they do bend the knee! And before they crucify him the soldiers clothe him in purple and set a crown on his head – so what that it is of thorns? Every king is proclaimed by soldiers. It was necessary also for Jesus to be crowned figuratively by soldiers ⁴⁴.

Only Mark's readers can see Jesus' parodic enthronement is an actual one, complete with obligatory obeisance from soldiers.

After Jesus is crucified nearly every word of the narrative is heavy with this same sort of irony. Jesus is lifted up high with a revolutionary on his right and left, parodying a royal retinue (cf. 10,35-45) ⁴⁵. The soldiers divide up Jesus' clothes, and passers-by mock him, shaking their heads and jeering at his inability to save himself. For the characters in the narrative this is simple taunting, but both the head-wagging and jeering of the passers-by as well as the callous vulturing of the soldiers allude to Psalm 22, a fact that hints that these events are taking place according to the Scriptures.

⁴⁴ *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, 13.17.

⁴⁵ See J. MUDDIMAN, "The Glory of Jesus: Mark 10.37", *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (eds. L.D. HURST – N.T. WRIGHT) (Oxford – New York 1987) 51-58.

Moreover, the mockers at the cross call on Jesus to save himself, whereas the mockers in the psalm call on God to save the sufferer⁴⁶. As Marcus notes, “This discrepancy ... makes a theological point: the mockers do not realize that Jesus and God are so intertwined that Jesus’ salvific power *is* the power of God and that Jesus’ kingship, far from being a joke, participates in that of God”⁴⁷. In other words, the mockers unintentionally associate Jesus with both the sufferer and the savior of Psalm 22. Similarly, the chief priests and scribes ask Jesus to come down from the cross so that they might “see and believe” that he is the Christ (15,32), but it is precisely by being pinioned to the cross — not by performing works of power — that his messiahship is demonstrated. And when the onlookers interpret Jesus’ cry to God as a cry to Elijah, they unwittingly allude to the fact that Elijah already came and met a violent end just as Jesus does (cf. 9,11-13)⁴⁸. Again and again the flow of the narrative asks the readers to see the reality behind the burlesque and confess Jesus to be the crucified Christ.

Then, after Jesus dies with a loud cry, Mark writes ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἔξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἔξέπνευσεν εἶπεν· ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν. Given the fact that the entire passion narrative is written on two levels, it would seem sensible to read this comment accordingly: the centurion flings one final insult at the man who, by his ignoble crying death, has proven he was no divine man at all. Indeed, nearly every word of v. 39 is dripping with *double entendre*, making it the *pièce de résistance* of the entire passion narrative⁴⁹. At the story level, the centurion sees that Jesus died crying out in fear or agony, and so he quips, “Truly this man was a son of a god”. After all, no god rescued him, and he died without honor.

⁴⁶ See Ps 22,8-9 (Ps 21 LXX): “All who saw me mocked me; they talked with the lips; they shook their head [Mark 15,29]: ‘He hoped in the Lord; let him rescue him; let him save him [Mark 15,30-32], because he desired him’”.

⁴⁷ MARCUS, *Mark 8–16*, 1051.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1065.

⁴⁹ Iverson (“A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39”, 335) objects to reading 15,39 in light of preceding taunts because it lacks explicit definition of the intended force of the words unlike 15,20,29 *passim*. This argument is based on Iverson’s dismissal of the possibility that ἔξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ signals opposition. As noted above, the phrase ἔξ ἐναντίας frequently describes opposing parties, and it was frequently omitted by later interpreters of Mark.

It is not surprising, however, that the Gospel pushes the readers to a rather different conclusion from the centurion's. The readers adopt the centurion's words, but invest them with different meaning; the fact that Jesus died in agonizing godforsakenness becomes the very ground of belief in Jesus as the Son of God — thus the ambiguity of υἱὸς θεοῦ is precisely the point. Mark quite boldly attempts to make the most disreputable and lowly aspect of Jesus' career — the final moment of his crucifixion — the basis of a confession that he is the Son of God.

Mark's description of the centurion standing against Jesus (ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ) may be another play on words. Harry L. Chronis notes that in the LXX ἐναντίος is frequently used to describe standing in the presence or in the face of God, oftentimes in a cultic setting⁵⁰. Mark abruptly inserts the reference to the rending of the temple curtain in-between Jesus' dying breath in v. 37 and the centurion's remark in v. 39. Many commentators have suggested that the centurion saw the curtain rip, but Mark gives no such indication. The readers of Mark, however — those who actually confess Jesus to be the Son of God — do "see" the curtain being torn open by God (ἐσχίσθη) just as the heavens were torn open at Jesus' baptism (1,10). Thus, while the centurion stands "against" Jesus, he also stands "before" Jesus, whose true identity is revealed when the temple veil is torn. Chronis writes:

The God whose פָּנִים, whose "face" or "presence" was veiled within the *sanctum sanctorum* (Exod 33:11, 14) himself rips away the veil and shows his "face", manifests his "presence." By inserting 15:38 so as to bring it into immediate juxtaposition with 15:37, Mark intends ... to draw out metaphorically the self-revelatory force of Jesus' death. In other words, 15:38 functions at least in large measure as a potent cipher for the "material disclosure" of the messianic secret in

⁵⁰ H.L. CHRONIS, "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39", *JBL* 101 (1982) 97-114. E.g., Exod. 27,21: "In the tent of witness outside of the veil (τοῦ καταπέτασματος) that is over the covenant (cf., Mark 15:38), Aaron and his sons shall burn it from evening until morning before the Lord (ἐναντίου κυρίου). This is a perpetual precept for your descendants from the sons of Israel" (NETS). Cf., also Exod 28,12; 34,24; Lev 1,3; 4,7; Deut 12,18; Pss 87,2; 94,6; 108,14.15. In Deut 18,5.7 the Levites are described as those who stand before the Lord (οἱ παρεστηκότες ἐκεῖ ἐναντι κυρίου), just as the centurion stood before Jesus (ὁ παρεστηκώς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ).

15:37. But because 15:38 is already a natural cipher for theophany, the impact of its insertion here must be obvious: it characterizes the christophany as a theophany! Jesus' self-disclosure is an act of divine self-disclosure. In his death, which culminates his mission of rejection and suffering (and thus satisfies the need for secrecy), Jesus manifests his true identity; and the effect, according to Mark, is equivalent to God himself showing his "face" ⁵¹.

In short, the concurrence of the climactic revelation of Jesus as the Son of God and the ripping of the temple veil — an act which exposes the God who dwells within and is described with a divine passive of σχίζω as in 1,10 — can hardly be accidental. The centurion stands "in the presence of" the God who dwelt in the temple.

Yet, Chronis' interpretation is weakened by his assumption that the centurion's confession is sincere. He argues that his interpretation avoids artificial explanations of how the centurion could have seen the temple veil, claiming that he only "modestly assumes only that Mark would have known what (whom!) the veil's destruction would have left exposed" ⁵². Like Marcus, Chronis conflates the story and the discourse of Mark; surely Mark was indeed interested in "whom" the veil's destruction left exposed, but this does not explain why, at the story level, the centurion would suddenly think that the pathetic corpse dangling in front of him was a son of God. A two-level reading of ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ is in keeping with the rest of v.39, and, indeed, with the rest of the passion narrative. The centurion stands "against" the man he mocks, but the readers see the rending of the temple veil and know the centurion truly is standing "in the presence of" the Son of God.

* *

*

For both ancient and modern interpreters of Mark two habits of reading have commended a "sincere" interpretation of the centurion's words. First, interpreters have read Mark through the lens of Matthew and Luke where it is clear that the centurion is not being snide. Furthermore, the Johannine claim that Jesus had the power

⁵¹ Ibid., 110

⁵² Ibid., 111.

to lay down his life (10,18) has led many to see Jesus' cry as a display of power rather than agony. Second, interpreters have tended to confuse what Mark is saying — that Jesus is the Son of God — with what the centurion is saying. The solution defended here avoids these two pitfalls by offering a simple solution: 15,39 is like the rest of Mark's passion narrative in that Jesus' enemy mockingly says something the readers know is actually true. This reading incorporates the pre-modern attention to the repetition of ἐξέπνευσεν in v. 37 and v. 39 with the modern interest in Mark's use of irony, particularly his depiction of Jesus as the Son of God precisely in and through his death.

One might still object that this proposal fails the test of exegetical modesty: if the centurion's remark was sarcastic, why has everyone beginning with Matthew misunderstood it? One must confess that the sarcastic interpretation of the centurion is distinctively modern. Yet, as we have seen, relatively few interpreters of Mark prior to modernity had access to the text of Mark 15,39 found in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and other Alexandrian witnesses — the text printed by Westcott and Hort and now in the NA²⁸. Ancient Christians perceived a miracle in Jesus' dying gasp, and they changed the text of Mark to reflect this interpretation. Contemporary scholars interpret a version of Mark shorn of these accretions, but continue to assume that the centurion must have seen something extraordinary⁵³. Indeed, though interpretive inertia makes the sarcastic reading of 15,39 seem bold, it may be the most straightforward and obvious interpretation. The centurion's remark would be like every other insult hurled at Jesus from the foot of the cross: intended to mock but unintentionally revelatory. It differs from these other insults only because it is for the readers the final, climactic confession to which the entire narrative builds.

Notre Dame Seminary
New Orleans, LA

Nathan EUBANK

⁵³ This objection also assumes that Matthew only changed Mark when he misunderstood him. I would suggest that Matthew carefully expands and clarifies the Markan passion narrative. It does not follow that redaction implies misunderstanding.

SUMMARY

This article examines the reception-history of Mark 15,39 to shed new light on this pivotal and disputed verse. Mark's earliest known readers emended the text to clarify the centurion's feelings about Jesus and to explain how the centurion came to faith. Copyists inserted references to Jesus' final yell around the same time that patristic commentators were claiming that this yell was a miracle that proved Jesus' divinity, an interpretation which was enshrined in the Byzantine text and the Vulgate. The article concludes that a "sarcastic" reading is a more adequate description of 15,39 as found in B, NA²⁸ etc.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Inter-Levitical Polemics in the late 6th century BCE: The Evidence from Nehemiah 9

I. The Nehemiah Memoir and the Levites

The Nehemiah Memoir (Nehemiah 1–6*) has long served as a basis for the scholarly reconstruction of events in mid 5th century BCE Yehud, providing a relatively clear insight into at least one major ideological stream constituting the restored Jewish world under Achaemenid power ¹. As research in recent decades has made increasingly clear, the contents of Ezra-Nehemiah represent a partisan agenda, namely, that of the *gola* community returning from exile in Mesopotamia ², and one prominent feature of the Nehemiah Memoir in contributing to this partisan position is the important role played by Levites in the account. This no doubt draws from the long history Levites played as mediators between different social sectors throughout Israelite history, as Hutton, Cook and others have demonstrated ³. Nehemiah's empowerment of the Levites (12,47; 13,10.22.29.30) allowed him to receive important sacral support while simultaneously presenting Levites as a cast of imperial administrators, intimately intertwining these two dimensions of Jewish leadership ⁴.

The pairing of these spheres of conduct is, of course, presaged by the charge to Ezra in the Artaxerxes Rescript that Persian imperial law and the law of Ezra's traditional deity should function in tandem (Ezra 7,25-26). But it is also established in more subtle ways through the use of Levite traditional discourse in the characterization of Nehemiah's own

¹ For a recent evaluation of the Nehemiah Memoir as an historical resource, see J.P. BLENKINSOPP, *Judaism. The First Phase* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 2009) 93-100.

² BLENKINSOPP, *Judaism*, 86-116. See also D. JANZEN, "The Cries of Jerusalem: Ethnic, Cultic, Legal and Geographic Boundaries in Ezra-Nehemiah", *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah: Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader* (eds. M.J. BODA – P.L. REDDITT) (Sheffield 2008) 117-135.

³ J.M. HUTTON, "The Levitical Diaspora (I): A Sociological Comparison With Morocco's Ahansal", *Exploring the Longue Duree*. Festschrift L.E. Stager (ed. J.D. SCHLOEN) (Winona Lake, IN 2009) 223-230; S.L. COOK, *The Social Roots of Biblical Yahwism* (Atlanta, GA 2004) 231-236. See also M. LEUCHTER, *Samuel and the Shaping of Tradition* (Oxford 2013) 24-31.

⁴ On Nehemiah's interaction with the Levites, see H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography* (FAT 38; Tübingen 2004) 274-275.

lay leadership. A recent examination discusses how tropes from Deuteronomy and the book of Jeremiah, both steeped in Levitical rhetoric, were applied to Nehemiah's initiatives ⁵. These range from the importance of the term שַׁעַר in Deuteronomy and its deployment in the construction of the wall around Jerusalem (Nehemiah 3) to the enforcing of the Sabbath (Neh 13,15-21) and his proclamation of economic liberty for indebted Jews (Nehemiah 5), both of which find notable precedent within the Jeremiah tradition as well (Jer 17,19-27; 34,14-20) ⁶. We should also note the nearly identical superscription forms of Jer 1,1 and Neh 1,1, suggesting hermeneutical equivalency between Nehemiah's policies and the oracles of a prophet who advocated submission to foreign imperialism ⁷.

II. Levites in Exile and Levites in Judah

Major turns in Nehemiah's tenure are therefore refracted through these Levitical traditions, and the implication is that the *gola* group represented by Nehemiah had the allegiance and support of the Levites who promoted and preserved these traditions. But this certainly flattens a far more textured and complicated set of circumstances characterizing Yehudite society in the late 6th – mid 5th centuries BCE. As Schaper, Hanson and Tiemeyer and others have rightly noted, the Judahite populations who did not endure exile possessed their own Levites who sustained religious life in the homeland throughout the Neo-Babylonian period ⁸. These scholars view Levites as almost entirely associated with these homeland groups and only gradually incorporated into a larger social collective involving the *gola* community ⁹. Though this view requires some adjustment — there is good evidence for Levite populations in exile (e.g., Ezra 8,15-19) — there can be little doubt that the homeland communities retained their own Levite clans, certainly suggested by the intimate connection between Levites and small scale hinterland settlements intimated throughout

⁵ M. LEUCHTER, "The Politics of Ritual Rhetoric: A Proposed Sociopolitical Context for the Redaction of Leviticus 1–16", *VT* 60 (2010) 345-365. The matter of Deuteronomy's connection to the Levites is still debated, but Levite-scribal authorship may still be defended. See LEUCHTER, *Samuel and the Shaping of Tradition*, 16-20.

⁶ LEUCHTER, "The Politics of Ritual Rhetoric", 361.

⁷ LEUCHTER, "The Politics of Ritual Rhetoric", 360.

⁸ J. SCHAPER, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda* (FAT 31; Tübingen 2000) 163-164; P.D. HANSON, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Minneapolis, MN 1979) 226-227; L.S. TIEMEYER, "Abraham – A Judahite Prerogative", *ZAW* 120 (2008) 49-66, here 63.

⁹ SCHAPER, *Priester und Leviten*, 290-301.

Deuteronomy. The great hostility preserved in Ezra-Nehemiah toward the homeland population (a feature that permeates every redactional stratum of the work)¹⁰ would certainly have been directed to the Levites of the homeland as well. Thus when Nehemiah rallies “the Levites” to his gubernatorial cause, this most likely did not include Levites connected to groups that the *gola* returnees rebuffed and rejected.

This fracturing of Levites into separate camps must have been a point of special contention and debate. Though the image of a united Levite front in Ezra-Nehemiah may be rhetorically motivated, it presupposes some semblance of an earlier reality when Levites in late monarchic Judah had galvanized in different ways. From the late 8th century BCE onward, Levite clans had developed a sense of tribal kinship, had adopted Moses as a patron saint, and shared ownership of ancient liturgical traditions deriving from the pre-state period¹¹. Throughout the 7th century, most had also endured socio-economic disadvantage and marginal or liminal social standing in the wake of Hezekiah’s program of urbanization (705-701) and the subsequent devastation of Sennacherib’s campaign (701)¹². By the end of the monarchic period, the early edition(s) of Deuteronomy became symbolic of the Levites’ vital role in mediating between YHWH and Israel, and certainly bound Levites together in a sort of solidarity as the monarchic infrastructure began to crumble¹³.

Levitical solidarity must have been tested, however, when the conditions of exile fractured their ranks. Those in exile adjusted their shared traditions in response to their own experiences (leading to expanded versions of the books of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah later utilized in the Nehemiah Memoir, for instance) to which homeland Levites were not privy during the period of Persian restoration, and to which these homeland Levites could not turn as icons of their own identity¹⁴. For those Levites

¹⁰ JANZEN, “The Cries of Jerusalem”.

¹¹ COOK, *Social Roots*, 262-266. Cook argues that the Levites were a tribe dating to the pre-state period. Other scholars have provided evidence to the contrary, but both P and Deuteronomy identify them with tribal language. Cook’s observation about the Levite promotion of pre-state traditions is therefore still applicable, though Levite tribalization may be the result of their own evolving social function and organization over a long period of time.

¹² N. NA’AMAN, “Sojourners and Levites in the Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century B.C.E.”, *ZABR* 14 (2008) 237-279, here 274-279, though some of NA’AMAN’s skepticism regarding northern Levites residing in Judah will be challenged below.

¹³ See above *re*: the Levitical contribution to the construction of Deuteronomy.

¹⁴ See especially M. LEUCHTER, *The Polemics of Exile in Jeremiah 26–45* (New York – Cambridge 2008) 161-176, for the Shaphanide development of tradition in an exilic context.

not sharing in the *gola* discourses, common Levitical ideology and mythology from the pre-exilic period must have become a matter of debate in the face of how the *gola* group had appropriated them.

III. The Levitical Origin of Nehemiah 9

The prayer in Nehemiah 9 is suggestive of this tension. Though scholarship has proffered different possibilities for the compositional origins of this work ¹⁵, there are compelling reasons to view the prayer as composed during the exilic period (as argued by Williamson) or the earliest decades of the Persian period (as argued by Boda) specifically by homeland Levites ¹⁶. Several scholars have pointed to the late addition of this prayer to the developing Ezra-Nehemiah corpus; this is very likely the case, since it appears in a unit that seems to address the needs of an audience in the late Persian or even early Hellenistic period, as Wright and others have suggested (on which see further below) ¹⁷. However, this by no means precludes its origins as a composition preserved and transmitted independently of the evolving Ezra and Nehemiah accounts before its introduction into its current setting. One finds, for example, a similar situation in Daniel 9. Most commentators view Daniel's penitential prayer (vv. 4-19) as deriving from a considerably earlier period than the surrounding chapter; the 2nd century BCE author of Daniel 9 inherited an earlier (and probably well-known) liturgical work with a decidedly Priestly emphasis, incorporating it into his narrative in order to intertwine an old and venerated Priestly pietistic theology with the more specific rhetorical aims of the chapter ¹⁸.

The same may be said about the process of incorporation of the prayer in Nehemiah 9 into its current setting: a late redactor bolsters the rhetorical

¹⁵ For a convenient overview of scholarly positions regarding the prayer's provenance, see TIEMEYER, "Abraham", 61-63.

¹⁶ M.J. BODA, *Praying the Tradition*. The Origin and Use of Tradition in Nehemiah 9 (BZAW 277; Berlin – New York 1999) 190. So also the implications of Tiemeyer's discussion ("Abraham", 63).

¹⁷ J.L. WRIGHT, "A New Model for the Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah", *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – G.N. KNOPPERS – R. ALBERTZ) (Winona Lake, IN 2007) 345-346. See also D.M. CARR, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. A New Reconstruction (Oxford 2011) 207-209; K. SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*. Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible (Winona Lake, IN 2010) 282-286.

¹⁸ M. LEUCHTER, "From Levite to Máskil in the Persian and Hellenistic Eras", *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition* (eds. M. LEUCHTER – J.M. HUTTON) (Atlanta, GA 2011) 227 n. 50.

purpose of Nehemiah 8–10 by making this older liturgical work its centerpiece. That this centerpiece is placed in the mouth of Levites is suggestive of the sacerdotal typology that initially composed it and which may well have preserved it before its incorporation into Nehemiah 8–10. Of particular interest is the northern/Israelian linguistic profile of the prayer as noted by Rendsburg in a learned study that appeared in this journal in 1991¹⁹. From Rendsburg's perspective, the linguistic features reveal that at least some northern populations retained a sense of cultural and religious contiguity during and after several crises involving foreign empires, with Nehemiah 9 serving as a parade example²⁰. Tiemeyer has more recently offered a different proposal, namely, that northerners mingling with Judahites at the Mizpah administrative center which endured throughout the period of the exile provides the basis for the northern, Israelian linguistic features that Rendsburg noted²¹.

None of these proposals demands that the prayer be categorized as a product of Levites, but two additional factors warrant attention. First, most scholars agree that the Levites in late-monarchic Judah are in large part refugees from the fallen northern kingdom²² and were thus already given to northern/Israelian forms of dialect in their own traditional liturgies. The retention of these linguistic modalities among Levites seems to have been quite durable, as the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 (a northern composition ultimately preserved in a Judahite literary work) demonstrates²³. This is reinforced by the second consideration, and that is the evidence marshalled by Lipschits that the majority of the homeland population fled from the southern and central Judahite hills to the northern frontier of Judah and the region of Benjamin, i.e., a territory where the Israelian linguistic forms were part of native speech²⁴. Levites already preserving northern/Israelian dialects would have been able to engage more freely in the composition of traditions bearing this linguistic trait when

¹⁹ G.A. RENDSBURG, "The Northern Origin of Nehemiah 9", *Bib* 72 (1991) 348-366.

²⁰ RENDSBURG, "Northern Origins", 365-366.

²¹ TIEMEYER, "Abraham", 63.

²² LEUCHTER, *Polemics of Exile*, 105-107, O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem* (Winona Lake, IN 2005) 84-85; H.P. NASUTI, *Tradition History and the Psalms of Asaph* (SBLD 88; Atlanta, GA 1988) 194; COOK, *Social Roots*, 65-66. For epigraphic evidence, see W.M. SCHNIEDEWIND – G.A. RENDSBURG, "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription: Historical and Linguistic Perspectives", *IEJ* 60 (2010) 188-203.

²³ On the northern/Israelian features of Deuteronomy 32, see G.A. RENDSBURG, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (SBLM 43; Atlanta, GA 1990) 64-65, 76-77, 99-100.

²⁴ LIPSCHITS, *The Fall And Rise of Jerusalem*, 258-271.

operating in such an environment ²⁵. This fixed the linguistic genotype of the prayer before these populations eventually returned south in the latter part of the 6th century BCE, where it probably obtained public currency even before the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple ²⁶.

Other factors also suggest a Levitical imprimatur on Nehemiah 9. Apart from the text's own conceit that the prayer is voiced by Levites ²⁷, Nehemiah 9 invokes the images and concepts that all Levites would have affirmed: the Exodus, the Sinai revelation, and the agency of Moses (Neh 9,9-14) ²⁸. The authors of Nehemiah 9 also employ variations on the *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* formula (Neh 9,10.32) common to both the Deuteronomistic and Jeremiatic traditions ²⁹, as well as the memory of the rejection and slaying of prophets (Neh 9,26.30; cf. Jer 2,30) ³⁰, and appeal to legal tradition in a manner similar to late-monarchic penitential prayers in Jeremiah ³¹. Two other features are especially hallmarks of Levite tradition. The first is a cluster of terms recalling divine mercy in the wilderness:

But thou art a God ready to pardon, gracious and full of compassion (וְרַחוּם וְחַנּוּן), slow to anger (אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם), and plentiful in mercy (וְרַב [נִ]חָסֵד), and forsook them not [...] (Neh 9,17)

The language here draws directly from the liturgical formula in Exod 34,6-7, where Moses declares the attributes of divine mercy. Research into the formation of the Book of the Twelve has demonstrated that this formula is deployed at regular and strategic intervals throughout the work ³². No-

²⁵ See similarly RENDSBURG, "Northern Origins", 354.

²⁶ BODA, *Praying The Tradition*, 190-195.

²⁷ MT; the LXX ascribes the prayer to Ezra.

²⁸ Pace TIEMEYER, "Abraham", 63, who states that Moses receives no mention in the prayer.

²⁹ J.C. GEOGHEGAN, "Until This Day"; ID., *The Time, Place, and Purpose of the Deuteronomistic History*. The Evidence of "Until This Day" (BJS 347; Providence, RI 2006) 159-164.

³⁰ BODA, *Praying the Tradition*, 81-87.

³¹ On the role of law in the prayer, see P.M. SPRINKLE, *Law and Life*. The Interpretation of Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and in Paul (WUNT 2,241; Tübingen 2008) 41. See further M.J. BODA, "From Complaint to Contrition: Peering Through the Liturgical Window of Jer 14,1 – 15,4", *ZAW* 113 (2001) 195-197.

³² See especially J. WÖHRLE, "So many Cross-References! Methodological Reflections on the Problem of Intertextual Relationships and their Significance for Redaction Critical Analysis", *Perspectives on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve*. Methodological Foundations – Redactional Processes – Historical Insights (eds. R. ALBERTZ – J.D. NOGALSKI – J. WÖHRLE) (BZAW 433; Berlin – Boston, MA 2012) 3-20.

galski has recently made a compelling case that this (among other pieces of evidence) points to Levite scribes as the redactors of the Book of the Twelve³³; it would therefore seem that this liturgical formula was strongly associated with Levite tradition and was infused into the Book of the Twelve to reinforce that tradition within the Jerusalem temple curriculum of which the Book of the Twelve eventually became a central feature³⁴. Its presence in Neh 9,17 points to a similar circle of Levite tradents standing behind the prayer in an earlier period.

The second feature strongly suggesting Levite authorship is the manner in which Israel's monarchic-era rebellion is characterized later in the prayer:

And they took fortified cities, and a fat land (שְׂמִנָּה), and possessed houses full of all good things, cisterns hewn out, vineyards, and oliveyards, and fruit trees in abundance; so they did eat (וַיֵּאָכְלוּ), and were filled (וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ), and became fat (וַיִּשְׁמְנוּ), and luxuriated in thy great goodness. Nevertheless they were disobedient, and rebelled against thee, and cast thy law behind their back [...] (Neh 9,25)

Not only the tenor but the wording of these verses recalls the Song of Moses, a Levite-composed liturgy which castigates its monarchic-era audience in startlingly similar terms³⁵:

Curd of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and he-goats, with the kidney-fat of wheat; and of the blood of the grape thou drankest foaming wine. But Jeshurun waxed fat (וַיִּשְׂמֵן), and kicked — thou didst wax fat (שְׂמִנָּה), thou didst grow thick (עָבִיר), thou didst become gross (בָּשִׁיר)! And he forsook God who made him, and contemned the Rock of his salvation [...] (Deut 32,14-15)

The thematic overlap between Neh 9,25 and the Song of Moses are obvious. Not only is the agrarian imagery typical of old Levitical mythology³⁶, but the threefold litany highlighting the gluttonous consumption of

³³ J.D. NOGALSKI, "One Book and Twelve Books: The Nature of the Redactional Work and Implications of the Cultic Source Material in the Book of the Twelve", *Two Sides of a Coin. Juxtaposing Views on Interpreting the Book of the Twelve/Twelve Prophetic Books* (eds. E. BEN ZVI – J. D. NOGALSKI) (Analecta Georgiana 201; Piscataway, NJ 2009) 11-46, here 40-46.

³⁴ The work was already presupposed as such by Ben Sira in the early 2nd century BCE (Sir 49,10).

³⁵ M. LEUCHTER, "Why is the Song of Moses in the book of Deuteronomy?", *VT* 57 (2007) 295-317, here 314-317.

³⁶ COOK, *Social Roots*, 78-81; LEUCHTER, *Samuel and the Shaping of Tradition*, 28-31.

monarchic society in both passages suggests a conscious tapping of an established Levite formulaic criticism. The sense is retrospective in Neh 9,25 whereas Deut 32,15 presents a second person invective against an (imagined or ostensible) contemporaneous audience, but both presuppose a common egregious disregard for the source of their agrarian sustenance. These motifs appear in texts that are decidedly *gola* in orientation (Haggai, for example), indicating that the *gola* community built them into an ideology consonant with their own exilic experience. However, in Nehemiah 9, the reference to these traditions is set alongside the prayer's overt rejection of exile as somehow bestowing honor or blessing:

Yet many years did you extend mercy to them, and forewarned them by your spirit through your prophets; yet would they not give ear; therefore you gave them into the hand of the peoples of the lands. (v. 30)

Contrary to the ideology of the *gola* group, the exile is not conceived here as a space or experience where law and covenant could take root. Rather, it is evidence of a rejection of covenantal principles and proof that those who endured it turned away from prophetic instruction. We therefore see several factors that shed light on the manner in which Levitical ideology developed among the homeland Levites during the period of the exile that are reflected in the prayer. The broad range of topics has much in common with texts and concepts that clearly grew among those Levites who were settled in Babylon (e.g., Jer 31,31-34; Deut 30,1-10)³⁷, but the orientation or angle of vision appears to constitute some form of response to that event. Put differently, the rhetoric of Nehemiah 9 seems to be well aware of the *gola* ideology that those taken into exile were somehow closer to YHWH's good graces and that the deity had rejected those who remained behind.

IV. The Origin of the Confrontation

While this rhetorical stance might reflect unpleasant confrontations between homeland and *gola* groups in the early years of the Persian period, the origins of this divisive social view may be traced to a period antedating even the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Jeremiah 29 contains messages offered to the captives of 597 that YHWH was still in dialogue with them, specifying that they should seek the welfare of the

³⁷ M.Z. BRETTLER, "Predestination in Deuteronomy 30.1-10", *Those Elusive Deuteronomists. The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (eds. L.S. SCHEARING – S.L. MCKENZIE) (JSOTSS 268; Sheffield 1999) 171-188.

land to which they were sent ³⁸. The same chapter carries indications of what obtains in Jeremiah 24, the vision of the good and bad figs which makes abundantly clear that the homeland groups were unworthy of divine patronage, while the *gola* group received divine favor ³⁹. In addition, Ezekiel seems to have developed a pro-*gola* ideology already before the fall of Jerusalem, which persists in subsequent oracles conceived shortly after the city's destruction and the resulting waves of migration to the east ⁴⁰.

Thus well before the geographical separation between Levites on either side of this divide, foundations for the *gola* ideology were already laid by authoritative prophets working before the end of the monarchy. That a large corpus of Jeremianic material developed in Babylon is credited (at least symbolically) to Baruch — who is last reported to be in Egypt (Jeremiah 43) — is suggestive of interchange throughout the region during the exilic period ⁴¹. If this is the case, it is likely that homeland Judahites were aware of the growing exclusivist rhetoric developing among their former countrymen now residing in Babylon. This is especially the case if, as per Lipschits' observations, the majority of the homeland population lived in a territory proximate to the administrative center at Mizpah, where reports from the heart of the empire would have circulated ⁴². The composition of Nehemiah 9 should be viewed against this social and historical backdrop. Its contents establish a discourse that counters the proposed privilege of returning exiles by tapping into motifs predating — and thus trumping — the captivity and displacement wrought by Babylon on both groups.

³⁸ M. LEUCHTER, "Personal Missives and National History: The Relationship between Jeremiah 29 and 36", *Prophets, Prophecy and Ancient Israelite Historiography* (eds. M.J. BODA – L.M. WRAY-BEAL) (Winona Lake, IN 2013) 275-293.

³⁹ Jeremiah 24 may be a Persian period composition; see D. ROM-SHILONI, "Group Identities in Jeremiah: Is it the Persian Period Conflict?" *A Palimpsest. Rhetoric, Ideology, Stylistics and Language Relating to Persian Israel* (eds. E. BEN ZVI – D.V. EDELMAN – F. POLAK) (Piscataway, NJ 2009) 17-21. However, it develops ideas already associated with the prophet's teachings as suggested by the shared motif in Jeremiah 29.

⁴⁰ D. ROM SHILONI, "Ezekiel as the Voice of the Exiles and Constructor of Exilic Ideology", *HUCA* 76 (2005) 1-45. See also BLENKINSOPP, *Judaism*, 125-159.

⁴¹ J.R. LUNDBOM has noted a Babylonian military incursion into Egypt ca. 582 BCE as discussed by Josephus (*Jeremiah* 37–52 [AB 21C; New York 2004] 208, 215), which points to an administrative/communicative network in advance of the campaign and no doubt following it as well.

⁴² LIPSCHITS, *Fall and Rise of Jerusalem*, 109-112, 258-271.

V. Conclusion

That Nehemiah 9 ultimately reaches us in a *gola*-oriented work such as Ezra-Nehemiah might indicate that it was added to that work at a time when partisan opposition between *gola* and homeland tensions had somewhat subsided. Wright's model of the redactional development of Ezra-Nehemiah allows for this, as he identifies Nehemiah 8–10 as a rather late addition to the work and thus reflecting a time when priorities and points of discord had changed within the various groups vying for a place in late Persian Yehud (or in the early days of the Hellenistic period)⁴³. On the other hand, it may suggest the very opposite, namely, that it was introduced into Ezra-Nehemiah specifically to appropriate the prayer for the *gola* group. Some precedent for this is found in the redaction of the Song of Moses into the book of Deuteronomy that tacitly supported Josiah's royal initiatives; ostensibly this bias is offset by the inclusion of the older, rival tradition of protest⁴⁴. The redaction of Nehemiah 9 into its current context may serve the same purpose, empowering the *gola* Levites and affirming their exclusive hegemony over authoritative petition and penitential prayer. Tiemeyer comes to a somewhat similar conclusion by asserting that the Judahite prayer is only secondarily placed in the mouth of the Levites in the larger narrative setting⁴⁵, but we may propose here a slight adjustment to Tiemeyer's argument: that the prayer, conceived by one Levite group, has been assigned to another for polemical or propagandistic purposes.

In any case, this suggests that well into the Persian period, perhaps down to the very end of that period (and into the Hellenistic era), the schism between different Levite groups persisted, with reconciliation brought about only over a very extended period of time. Such is the impression one gets from comparing the work of the Chronicler to most of what obtains in Ezra-Nehemiah; it is only in Chronicles that we encounter an attempt to bridge gaps, not only between broad communities but between the Levites associated with them. The writing of disparate clans into the fabric of common history (1 Chronicles 1–9) anticipates the much larger project of weaving a wide spectrum of Levite lineages into the foundations of the common national cult⁴⁶. Perhaps the emergence of other

⁴³ WRIGHT, "New Model", 346.

⁴⁴ LEUCHTER, "Why is the Song of Moses in the Book of Deuteronomy?", 317.

⁴⁵ TIEMEYER, "Abraham", 63.

⁴⁶ On the inclusive strategy of the Chronicler's genealogies, see the exhaustive analysis by G.N. KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 1–9* (AB 12; New York 2003) *passim*; ID., "Intermarriage, Ethnic Diversity and Social Complexity in the Genealogy of Judah", *JBL* 120 (2001) 15–30.

outsider groups and institutions like the Samaritans and their cult and temple at Mt. Gerizim contributed to the change in attitude ⁴⁷. Or perhaps the biblical writers simply saw fit to let bygones be bygones as the rising storm from Macedon forced them to re-evaluate the terms of their own survival.

Department of Religion
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122 (USA)

Mark LEUCHTER

SUMMARY

The Levitical prayer in Nehemiah 9 contributes to the *gola*-ideology running throughout Ezra-Nehemiah, but scholars have generally recognized that its compositional origins are to be connected to the Homeland communities of the exilic or early Persian periods. The present study identifies features in the prayer which suggest that its authors were Levites associated with the Homeland communities and that these authors crafted the prayer in response to the exclusive and elitist ideology of the *gola* groups. The prayer testifies to tensions within Levite circles well into the Persian period and possibly even beyond.

⁴⁷ J.W. WATTS, *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus*. From Sacrifice to Scripture (New York – Cambridge 2007) 164-170.

Intertextuality, Inner-Biblical Exegesis, and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology

I. This Again?¹

It seems that no stone has been left unturned in the search for intertexts, allusions, and echoes within the biblical text since Michael Fishbane's magisterial work in inner-biblical exegesis thirty years ago². Fishbane explicitly avoided the label "intertextuality" to describe his method, opting instead to call his work "inner-biblical exegesis". Not all scholars followed suit, however, and it quickly became popular to use intertextuality as the label for all manner of investigations into literary relationships between various texts. Shortly after Fishbane wrote, Ellen van Wolde accused biblical scholars of the ugliest sort of methodological sin, that of using intertextuality merely as a way to "supply labels" in order to make their work sexier³. Despite such criticism, Paul Noble could state some thirteen years later that, "'Intertextuality' is currently used with widely divergent meanings by different scholars, depending upon their hermeneutical persuasions. Since, however, these issues have little bearing on the subject-matter of the present article, I simply state that I shall here be using 'intertextuality' very broadly, for the interpretative relationships that pertain between texts"⁴. Nearly a decade after Noble, Geoffrey Miller could still write, "Unfortunately, consistent use of terminology, especially the word 'intertextuality', has been lacking"⁵. Not all scholars have consented to using the term so broadly; rather, some have sought methodological clarity when "supplying labels" so that the present state of scholarship represents three primary trajectories

¹ I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, Joseph Ryan Kelly and William R. Osborne, for their insightful criticism of my misuse of terminology in a previous essay, which prompted me to address the issue here.

² M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985).

³ E. VAN WOLDE, "Trendy Intertextuality?" *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel (ed. S. DRAISMA) (Kampen 1989) 43-49, here 43.

⁴ P.R. NOBLE, "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions", *VT* 52 (2002) 219-252, here 219.

⁵ G. MILLER, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research", *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2011) 238-309, here 285.

for examining the relationship between texts: intertextuality, inner-biblical allusion, and inner-biblical exegesis ⁶.

After all the work that has been done, why an essay on the ethics of a methodology? Despite the advances in methodological consistency, there still seems to remain some confusion over exactly how and when to apply the appropriate term to one's task. Furthermore, after thirty years of defining and delineating terms, it is necessary that scholars begin to demonstrate transparency and clarity in their methodological vocabulary ⁷. Having myself committed the sin of misusing methodological terms, I am all too aware of the importance of using appropriate terminology ⁸, especially for authors committed to treating texts and their readers ethically ⁹. Thus, in an attempt to call for clarity and transparency, the present paper will outline the three primary methods for studying the literary relationships between texts in order to make clear the presuppositions and purposes of each method. Our discussion will demonstrate that intertextuality as a methodological label is problematic for scholars whose hermeneutical presuppositions include authorial intent, unless they are willing to abandon the diachronic element in their work. We will conclude by outlining principles of inner-biblical allusion and inner-biblical exegesis for deter-

⁶ See, e.g., MILLER, "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research"; B. SOMMER, "Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger", *VT* 46 (1996) 479-489; J. LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case", *JBL* 127 (2008) 241-265; K.W. WEYDE, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation: Methodological Reflections on the Relationship between Texts in the Hebrew Bible", *SEÁ* 70 (2005) 287-300.

⁷ Weyde also reflects on the importance of using terms precisely. But, citing the work of J. Nogalski, who utilizes synchronic and diachronic methods in his study, Weyde suggests that creating a sharp division between intertextuality and inner-biblical allusion and inner-biblical exegesis may not prove so helpful; see WEYDE, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation", 290-291; J. NOGALSKI, *Redactional Process in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin – New York 1993). However, I would still contend that once one moves to diachronic reflections, one is no longer employing an intertextual method.

⁸ R.L. MEEK, "The Meaning of לִבָּהּ in Qohelet: An Intertextual Suggestion", *The Words of the Wise are Like Goads*. Engaging Qohelet in the 21st Century (eds. M.J. BODA – T. LONGMAN III – C.G. RATA) (Winona Lake, IN 2013) 241-256.

⁹ See K.J. VANHOOZER, *Is There a Meaning in this Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Landmarks in Christian Scholarship; Grand Rapids, MI ²1998) 367-452. Vanhoozer argues that "the mandate for the ethical interpreter [is] as follows: 'Do not bear false witness.' *An interpreter, then, is one who bears true witness to textual meaning*" (*Meaning*, 439, emphasis original).

mining the relationships between biblical texts. These two methods cohere with the presupposition that authorial intention controls meaning, and therefore transparently employing their methodology will avoid the charges of inaccurately supplying the label of intertextuality and of being — as some will presuppose — inconsistent and therefore unethical.

II. Intertextuality

Julia Kristeva coined the term “intertextuality” in her 1966 essay, “Word, Dialogue, and Novel”¹⁰. For her work, Kristeva drew on Mikhail Bakhtin, who had focused on the use of specific texts by specific texts, pointing out that “[t]he boundary lines between someone else’s speech and one’s own speech were flexible, ambiguous, often deliberately distorted and confused. Certain kinds of texts were constructed like mosaics out of the text of others”¹¹. Kristeva’s originality lay in her application of Bakhtin’s theory of specific texts to a general theory of how all texts communicate with and relate to each other¹². For Kristeva, and literary theorists after her, a text is much more than words on paper. It is a “network of traces”¹³ coursing through all communicative media and “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double”¹⁴. Van Wolde goes so far as to argue that until a person reads a text, it is merely “a lifeless collection of words”¹⁵. Thus, as Richard Schultz states, in essence

¹⁰ J. KRISTEVA, “Word, Dialogue and Novel”, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Language and Art* (ed. L.S. ROUDIEZ; trans. T. GORA, A. JARDINE, and L.S. ROUDIEZ) (New York 1980 [1969]) 64-91. For surveys of intertextuality and its counterparts, see MILLER, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research”, 283-309; and K. SCHMID, “Innerbiblische Schriftauslegung. Aspekte der Forschungsgeschichte”, *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift. Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (eds. R.G. KRATZ – TH. KRÜGER – K. SCHMID) (BZAW 300; Berlin – New York 2000) 1-22.

¹¹ S. MURRAY, “Intertextuality”, *Encyclopedia of Literary Critics and Criticism*. 2 vols. (ed. C. MURRAY) (London 1999) 1:560; cited in R.L. SCHULTZ, “Intertextuality, Canon, and ‘Undecidability’: Understanding Isaiah’s ‘New Heavens and New Earth’ (Isaiah 65:17-25)”, *BBR* 20 (2010) 19-38, here 21.

¹² SCHULTZ, “Intertextuality, Canon, and ‘Undecidability’”, 21.

¹³ W.S. VORSTER, “Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte”, *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings. Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (ed. S. DRAISMA) (Kampen 1989) 15-26, here 20-21.

¹⁴ KRISTEVA, “Word, Dialogue, and Novel”, 66.

¹⁵ VAN WOLDE, “Trendy Intertextuality?” 49.

“the emphasis shifts from users to uses and every expression carries with it semantic freight from other contexts in which it is employed”¹⁶.

Given these notions of texts and their relationships with each other, a few important implications arise for those who use (or claim to use) this methodology. First, the “text” in intertextuality is broken free from the constraints of the written word¹⁷. This is problematic for studies that purport to examine the written words of the Bible and seek to understand their relationships among each other. Faithful adherence to this methodology requires one to consider not only the written text but also the unwritten oral traditions that may lie behind it. This introduces a peculiar methodological problem, for one could discount nearly any proposed textual relationship with the notion that two written texts rely not on each other but on a separate oral tradition¹⁸. Cynthia Edenburg mitigates this difficulty by “taking a methodological stance which undertakes to consider all known evidence. Unknown witnesses cannot be considered evidence; in the eventuality that a new witness is uncovered, then it becomes potential evidence, but until then it cannot be other than a non-entity”¹⁹. However, Edenburg’s methodology is explicitly concerned with inner-biblical allusion, not intertextuality. If she held to the latter, then such a methodological stance would be “nonsensical”²⁰. Studies that would use a presuppositional stance to push aside the idea of an oral tradition underlying the suggested textual relationships are no longer employing an intertextual method.

Second, intertextuality is unconcerned with issues of determinacy or diachronic trajectory. What matters for intertextual theorists is the “network of traces”, not their origin or direction of influence. Furthermore, intertextuality is concerned with “a wide range of correspondences among texts”, and it “examines the relations among many texts” rather than the relationship between a narrow set of texts²¹. Thus, intertextuality is a strictly synchronic discussion of wide-ranging intertextual relationships that necessarily precludes author-centered, diachronic studies. This distinction should not be taken lightly because the term intertextuality leads

¹⁶ SCHULTZ, “Intertextuality, Canon, and ‘Undecidability’”, 21.

¹⁷ However, see Cynthia Edenburg’s work on different types of intertextuality, which distinguishes between aural and literary intertextual strategies; see C. EDENBURG, “Intertextuality, Literary Competence and the Question of Readership: Some Preliminary Observations”, *JSOT* 35 (2010) 131-148.

¹⁸ See NOBLE, “Esau, Tamar, and Joseph”, 220.

¹⁹ C. EDENBURG, “How (Not) to Murder a King: Variations on a Theme in 1 Sam 24; 26”, *SJOT* 12 (1998) 64-85, here 71.

²⁰ MILLER, “Intertextuality”, 294.

²¹ SOMMER, “Exegesis, Allusion, and Intertextuality”, 487.

readers to expect something entirely different than a diachronic study, making diachronic studies guilty of pulling a bait-and-switch, even if it is unintentional ²².

Third, the intertextual method is unconcerned with developing criteria for determining intertextual relationships between texts. As Miller states, “intertextuality is an inherent feature of all texts, and therefore such criteria are not essential” ²³. In a synchronic study of textual relationships, in which responsibility for determining textual relationships rests with the reader, there is little or no concern for proving that such a relationship resulted from authorial intent. This enables the reader to make connections without regard for homogeneity and propinquity, opening the door for the examination of textual relationships across vast spectra of time and place. This is not necessarily a bad thing, so long as authors of such studies are transparent about their enterprise. For those who use methodological labels appropriately, this is hardly a concern. However, the intertextual label becomes problematic when scholars use it but then develop criteria for demonstrating that textual relationships were intended. Once this occurs, the author has departed from intertextuality and entered into another realm altogether, for intertextuality presupposes that the connection of texts lies solely with the reader. Readers likewise play an important role in inner-biblical exegesis and inner-biblical allusion, but their role is to recognize and prove intended textual relationships ²⁴.

From these three criteria it becomes apparent that many so-called intertextual studies are something altogether different. What terminology remains for studies that utilize some of the insights of intertextuality yet begin with a different set of presuppositions?

III. Inner-Biblical Exegesis

As noted above, Michael Fishbane has done the most seminal work in inner-biblical exegesis. In a series of articles and books, he outlined the methodological principles for determining instances of inner-biblical exegesis, which he divided into three, and later four, categories: scribal exegesis (i.e. comments and corrections), legal exegesis, haggadic exegesis, and

²² For an example of this, see MEEK, “The Meaning of לִבָּהּ in Qohelet”.

²³ MILLER, “Intertextuality”, 285.

²⁴ This is an important distinction between intertextuality on the one hand and inner-biblical exegesis and inner-biblical allusion on the other. See L.C. STAHLBERG, *Sustaining Fictions: Intertextuality, Midrash, Translation, and the Literary Afterlife of the Bible* (LHBOTS 486; London – New York 2008) 28–58.

mantological exegesis²⁵. Though the type of exegetical maneuvering differs, the principles for determining textual relationships remain the same.

Inner-biblical exegesis seeks to isolate texts and examine texts that have in some way revised previous texts. In the case of scribal exegesis, the revision occurs most frequently in the form of explanatory comments that intend to enable later readers to understand unfamiliar terms or phrases, such as Josh 18,13 and Esth 3,7²⁶. For Fishbane, even such minor revision indicates “that the authoritative text being explicated was not considered inviolable but subject to the invasion of a tradition of interpretation which rendered it more comprehensible”²⁷. However, since the scribes chose to explain a difficult text rather than simply remove the incomprehensible phrase(s), they “insured that future readers would be forced to a realization not far removed from their own: that they are late-comers to the text, who must read it with the guidance of an oral — now written — exegetical tradition”²⁸.

The other three types of inner-biblical exegesis modify the text more significantly to apply an older text to a new situation. Thus, legal exegesis “is singularly concerned with the reinterpretation (or extension or reapplication) of pre-existing legal texts”²⁹ in cases where “lacunae or ambiguities in their legal formulation tend to render such laws exceedingly problematic — if not functionally inoperative — without interpretation”³⁰. Eugene Mc-

²⁵ See M. FISHBANE, “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis”, *JBL* 99 (1980) 343-361; ID., “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel”, *Midrash and Literature* (eds. G.H. HARTMAN – S. BUDICK) (New Haven, CT 1986) 19-37; ID., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*; ID., “The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition”, *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (ed. J.C. DE MOOR) (OTS 40; Leiden 1998) 15-30; ID., “Types of Biblical Intertextuality”, *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998* (eds. A. LEMAIRE – M. SÆBØ) (VTS 80; Leiden 2000) 39-44.

²⁶ FISHBANE, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies”, 21. See also M. BAR-ASHER, “The Bible Interpreting Itself”, *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible. The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D. DIAMANT – R. G. KRATZ) (BZAW 439; Berlin – Boston, MA 2013) 1-18. Bar-Asher’s essay deals with instances in which the biblical authors provided contextual explanations of individual words. While he does not specifically address “scribal exegesis”, his comments are instructive for understanding the process by which scribes explained words they viewed as unfamiliar to their audience.

²⁷ FISHBANE, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies”, 21.

²⁸ FISHBANE, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies”, 22.

²⁹ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 282.

³⁰ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 92. See also B. ROSENSTOCK, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis in the Book of the Covenant: The Case of the Sabbath Commandment”, *Conservative Judaism* 44 (1992) 37-49.

Garry points out that such is the case with a particular account of preparation of a Passover lamb: “The Chronicler reports that in the time of Josiah ‘they boiled the Passover lamb with fire, according to the ordinance’ ([...] 2 Chr 35:13). No single ‘ordinance’ prescribes such a culinary technique; rather, Deuteronomy indicates that the lamb should be boiled ([...] Deut 16:7), while Exodus insists that the lamb should not be boiled but ‘roasted with fire’”³¹. Thus, since the two legal texts offered different prescriptions regarding the Passover lamb, the preparers of the Passover feast in Chronicles welded the two legal texts into a new prescription that addressed the needs of the audience.

Whereas legal exegesis is concerned solely with the reinterpretation and reappropriation of previous legal texts, haggadic exegesis “utilizes pre-existing legal materials, but it also makes broad and detailed use of moral *dicta*, official or popular *theologoumena*, themes, motifs, and historical facts. In a word, haggadic exegesis ranges over the entire spectrum of ideas, genres, and texts of ancient Israel. It is these which form the basis of its textual transformations, reapplications, and reinterpretations”³². Furthermore, haggadic exegesis also differs from legal exegesis in that which gives rise to it in the first place. Later authors engaged in legal exegesis because of a perceived lack in the earlier tradition that required an interpreter to make the text applicable to a new situation. Haggadic exegesis, on the other hand, came about because of the fullness of a previous text. It does not “supplement gaps in the *traditum*, but characteristically draws forth latent and unsuspected meanings from it” to show how a law or other text “can transcend its original focus, and become the basis for a new configuration of meaning”³³. Very rarely does haggadic exegesis use explicit markers such as רמזאל to indicate its use of a *traditum* (e.g. Jer 3,1); more often, the exegesis uses implicit markers such as shared lexemes, thematic elements, and their reformulation, such as is the case with the use of Ps 8,5-7 in Job 7,17-18³⁴. The Joban use of Ps 8,5-7 can be detected by the repetition of vocabulary and theme, but Job’s revision of Ps 8,5-7 clarifies its use of the *traditum*. Thus, “[w]hereas the psalmist exalts the human species to near-divine status, and regards this exaltation as a sign of divine

³¹ E.P. MCGARRY, “The Ambidextrous Angel (Daniel 12:7 and Deuteronomy 32:40): Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Textual Criticism in Counterpoint”, *JBL* 124 (2005) 211-228, here 211.

³² FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 282.

³³ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 282-283.

³⁴ See C. FREVEL, “Eine Kleine Theologie der Menschenwürde: Ps 8 und seine Rezeption im Buch Hiob”, *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments. Festschrift für Erich Zenger* (eds. F. HOSSFELD – L. SCHWIENHORST-SCHÖNBERGER) (Freiburg – New York 2004) 247-272.

favour, Job inverts the liturgical teaching and mocks it, for he implies that God's providence is less than beneficial for humankind"³⁵.

Finally, mantological exegesis is confined to exegesis of "material which is ominous or oracular in scope and content"³⁶. Mantological exegesis is divided into exegesis of visual and auditory phenomena. For the former, the exegesis is limited to the interpreter's explanation of the visual material, such as is the case with Joseph's dreams in Gen 37,1-11. The *traditio*, or interpretation, occurs in the same text as the *traditum* and is not exegetically taken up again. The exegesis of auditory phenomena is similar to legal and haggadic exegesis in that later prophets will reinterpret the *traditum* when they think that it has for some reason or other failed or needs further explanation or expansion³⁷. Auditory mantological exegesis can be "non-transformative" exegesis, such as the "homiletical elaboration" of Zeph 3,3-4 by Ezek 22,25-28³⁸. It can also be "transformative", as when a later text interprets a previous text with "additions, specifications, or adaptations"³⁹, such as the reappropriation of 2 Sam 7,4-17 and 1 Chr 17,3-15 by the author of Psalm 89⁴⁰. As with haggadic exegesis, determining the relationship between texts requires that attention be paid to the repetition of linguistic and thematic elements and their reappropriation in a different context or to a different situation.

This examination of inner-biblical exegesis reveals several important issues for using inner-biblical exegesis as a methodology. First, it is clear that diachrony matters⁴¹. As Lyle Eslinger points out in his critique of Fishbane's methodology, inner-biblical exegesis "presumes a demonstrable precedence"⁴². If there is no diachronic relationship between texts, then there necessarily can be no inner-biblical exegesis, for in order for an author to explicate or elaborate on a text, it must have existed previously. This principle immediately distinguishes inner-biblical exegesis

³⁵ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 285.

³⁶ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 443.

³⁷ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 444.

³⁸ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 461-462. See also T.B. DOZEMAN, "Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh's Gracious and Compassionate Character", *JBL* 108 (1989) 207-223.

³⁹ FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 465.

⁴⁰ See N. SARNA, "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis", *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. A. ALTMANN) (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University 1: Studies and Texts; Cambridge, MA 1963) 29-46.

⁴¹ See FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 465; FISHBANE, "Revelation and Tradition", 344, 354, etc.

⁴² L. ESLINGER, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category", *VT* 42 (1992) 47-58, here 49.

from intertextuality, placing the burden of proof squarely on the shoulders of the one proposing a relationship between texts. Whereas with intertextuality one need not be concerned with issues of textual origins and directionality of influence, inner-biblical exegesis requires that scholars make known and defend their view of a text's provenance⁴³. For example, when Jeffrey Leonard examines the relationship between Psalm 78 and various texts in Exodus, if the psalm predates the Pentateuchal texts, then the whole enterprise falls apart⁴⁴. An intertextual study, on the other hand, need not concern itself with which text came first because all that matters is the reader-discerned network of traces between them.

Second, authorial intention plays a significant role in attempts to discern if and in what ways later texts reinterpreted previous texts. This second principle of determining authorial intention makes paramount that the reader use objective criteria that will help to discern whether or not the author intended for the reader to notice a textual relationship. The search for objective, measurable criteria sets apart inner-biblical exegesis from intertextuality in that the reader must discover multiple areas of overlap in an effort to demonstrate intentional borrowing. For this reason, scholars have developed criteria such as "otherwise unattested forms, words, or phraseology, as well as more common expressions which are utilized in a uniquely peculiar way", similar context or structure, "transformation and reactualization of a common element", and thematic similarities⁴⁵. Furthermore, the case for intention is strengthened as the evidence increases. Thus, shared vocabulary alone may point to intentional borrowing or literary influence, but when that shared vocabulary occurs in a similar context, but is reactualized for a different purpose, the chances increase that the author intends for the reader to make such a connection.

In sum, inner-biblical exegesis is methodologically preferable if a scholar is attempting to make a case that later authors are referring to a previous text in order to explicate, comment on, expand, or in some other way make it applicable to a new situation. This methodology differs from intertextuality in that it requires its proponents to defend directionality of influence and to demonstrate through objective criteria that a later text is

⁴³ On criteria for determining directionality of influence, see R. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989) 29-32.

⁴⁴ LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions", 27.

⁴⁵ EDENBURG, "How (Not) to Murder a King", 72. E.g. Isaiah's use of similar vocabulary in 40,1-10 as was used in 28,1-5. In the first instance the language was used to castigate the people, but in the second instance comforted them; see B. SOMMER, "Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Prophetic Tradition", *New Visions of Isaiah* (eds. R. MELUGIN – M. SWEENEY) (JSOTSS 214; Sheffield 1996) 156-186, here 158.

intentionally using a previous text for a particular purpose. However, there are cases in which scholars argue that a receptor text alludes to a source text for reasons other than exegesis. Perhaps an author is making a simple allusion or attempting to bring an earlier text to the reader's mind. In such cases, inner-biblical exegesis is insufficient, for the scholar is not arguing that the receptor text modifies a previous text.

IV. Inner-Biblical Allusion

Inner-biblical allusion and inner-biblical exegesis are often used interchangeably because their methodologies are similar; however, the distinctions between their theses require that they be employed in different contexts. In distinction from inner-biblical exegesis, inner-biblical allusion sets out to determine whether a receptor text has in some way referred to a source text, but the goal is not to demonstrate that the receptor text has modified the source text. Rather, with inner-biblical allusion the goal is simply to demonstrate that a later text in some way references an earlier text ⁴⁶.

Methodologically, inner-biblical allusion employs many of the same techniques as inner-biblical exegesis. Thus, shared language is of utmost importance for determining the presence of an allusion in a source text ⁴⁷. As with inner-biblical exegesis, the likelihood of allusion increases in relation to the amount of shared vocabulary as well as the nature of said vocabulary. That is, common vocabulary is less helpful in determining allusions than is unique or rare vocabulary ⁴⁸. Additionally, Benjamin Sommer points out that a source text may insert an intervening word between two words that appear together in a source text or use various rhyming techniques such as assonance and dissonance to cause the reader to think of a similar sounding word in a previous context ⁴⁹.

Thematic and contextual elements also play an important role in determining influence. Thus, if a word or group of words appear in a similar

⁴⁶ D.L. Petersen argues that allusion is not necessarily intentional: "the presence of echo in the derivative text does not constitute a consequential reuse of the earlier text. It is more of a literary fossil than a living entity in the new text"; see D.L. PETERSEN, "Zechariah 9–14: Methodological Reflections", *Bringing out the Treasure. Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (eds. M.J. BODA – M.H. FLOYD) (JSOTSS 370; London 2003) 210–224, here 212.

⁴⁷ See LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions", 241–265. However, Noble has pointed out some of the difficulties with over-reliance on shared vocabulary (NOBLE, "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph").

⁴⁸ LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions", 251.

⁴⁹ LEONARD, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions", 159–160.

context as the source text, the chances of intentional allusion are increased. Finally, Edenburg argues that “ungrammaticalization” clearly signals to the reader that allusion is occurring. She states: “‘Ungrammaticality’ arises in a narrative due to expressions formulated or used without regard for language norms, or dysfunctional motifs”⁵⁰. The purpose of “ungrammaticality” is to cause the reader “to seek another text in which the marker is well integrated, and to create a link between the two (or more) texts”⁵¹.

As with inner-biblical exegesis, it is clear that inner-biblical allusion is appropriate when a reader is seeking to determine the relationship between texts when the reader either presupposes or argues authorial intention or a diachronic relationship between texts. The primary difference in these two methodologies is that inner-biblical exegesis argues that the receptor text has in some way modified the source text, whereas inner-biblical allusion argues that the receptor text alludes to the source text with no attempt at modification⁵². Thus, when arguing that an author has reactualized or modified a source text, the term inner-biblical exegesis should be used and when arguing only for some type of allusion, the term inner-biblical allusion should be used.

V. The Ethical Use of Methodological Vocabulary

In 1989 Ellen van Wolde accused biblical scholars of misusing methodological vocabulary in order to make their work more appealing, and therefore more publishable. Despite the numerous works that have taken van Wolde’s criticism seriously and sought to distinguish between intertextuality and other, author-centered textual methodologies, in the two-plus decades since van Wolde’s essay we have seen no small number of studies that claim to employ intertextuality while in fact doing something entirely different.

This study has therefore reissued van Wolde’s call for methodological clarity by outlining the primary differences between intertextuality, inner-biblical allusion, and inner-biblical exegesis. We demonstrated that intertextuality should be used when the scholar engages in synchronic,

⁵⁰ LEONARD, “Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions”, 72-73.

⁵¹ LEONARD, “Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions”, 68.

⁵² See WEYDE, “Inner-Biblical Interpretation”. See also L. ESLINGER, “Hosea 12:5a and Genesis 32:20: A Study in Inner-Biblical Exegesis”, *JSOT* 18 (1980) 91-99, here 91, who points out the importance of restricting the term “inner-biblical exegesis” to “instances of citation or use of an actual biblical passage”.

reader-centered studies of the relationships between texts. If, however, a scholar is attempting to establish a textual relationship based on directionality of influence and/or authorial intention, then the language of inner-biblical exegesis or inner-biblical allusion should be used. Given the vast amount of literature that has distinguished between these three methodologies over the past forty years, it is no longer viable — and indeed is misleading and unethical — to employ the language of intertextuality when attempting to demonstrate — or presupposing — an intentional, historical relationship between texts.

Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
5001 N. Oak Trafficway
Kansas City, MO 64118 (USA)

Russell L. MEEK

SUMMARY

Intertextuality has been used to label a plethora of investigations into textual relationships. During the past few decades, the debate regarding the definition of intertextuality has largely been resolved, yet scholars continue to misuse the term to refer to diachronic and/or author-centered approaches to determining textual relationships. This article calls for employing methodological vocabulary ethically by outlining the primary differences between — and different uses for — intertextuality, inner-biblical exegesis, and inner-biblical allusion.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Robb Andrew YOUNG, *Hezekiah in History and Tradition* (VTS 155). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2012. xvii-367 p. 16 × 24,5. € 128 – \$175.00

Young's book is divided into three parts. The first part is dedicated to the reconstruction of the historical Hezekiah using mainly extrabiblical records; the second studies Hezekiah in 2 Kings and Isaiah; the third investigates the image of Hezekiah as presented in 2 Chronicles.

The first part is entitled "Hezekiah via extra-biblical material" and contains three chapters. The first chapter reassesses the old question of Hezekiah's regnal years by means of triangulating the events. To this end Y. establishes two fixed dates: the fall of Samaria and the fall of Jerusalem. As for the first date he accepts the theory of the double conquest of Samaria without offering any significant change and attributes the final conquest of Samaria to Sargon II which Y. dates to 720 BC. As for the second, Y. rejects the usual date 586 BC, based on the coordination of the biblical account and Babylonian chronicle *ABC* 5, and proposes 587 BC as the correct date for the fall of Jerusalem. Y.'s revision is based on the coordination of the fourth year of Jehoiaquim's reign with Nebuchadnezzar's first year as mentioned in Jer 25,1. Since the span between these two fixed dates corresponds to the number of years given in 2 Kings, he concludes that Hezekiah's first regnal year was 725 BC, and from these fixed dates he reconstructs a new chronology of the southern kings (22). Several extra-biblical data corroborate his new chronology. However appealing this new chronology may seem, it creates as many problems as it solves. According to this chronology, for example, Sennacherib's invasion should be dated to 711 BC instead of 701 BC, and 2 Kgs 17,2-6 describing the fall of Samaria would give a correct date but a wrong king. The author also critically reviews the question of whether Hezekiah was Ahaz's brother or son and opts for the latter.

The author reaches interesting conclusions concerning the queen Athaliah, whose name was found on a sarcophagus at Nimrud. Y. claims that the Assyrian name does not contain *yhwh* but rather the Ea theophoric ending, and consequently he rejects the proposal that the queen buried at Nimrud was Sennacherib's mother. The goal of the second chapter is to demonstrate by means of extrabiblical artifacts and archaeological evidence the importance of Judah in the 8th and 7th centuries BC. To this end, he briefly discusses the Azekah Inscription, Neo-Assyrian inscriptions

and letters, and the Siloam inscription. The list of documents and artifacts is far from complete. It would be helpful to examine also letters SAA XI 33.5-6; 57.1, other Hebrew inscriptions (cf. *HAE* I, 145-290), and to consider not simply the *lmlk* jars and the highly controversial western slope of Jerusalem, but also other potentially relevant archaeological artifacts. In the third chapter he evaluates various often controversial hypotheses on Sennacherib's third campaign. As the result of his study, Y. supports the theory of one campaign against the Levant. While admitting that Taharqo was clearly not the Egyptian pharaoh in 701 BC, he nevertheless argues that Taharqo was a skilled military leader able to conduct a military operation. Moreover, he concludes that the battle at Eltekeh should not be placed at the end of the campaign and considered the reason for Sennacherib's withdrawal. Young also concludes that the Hezekiah episode in Sennacherib's annals presenting him as "tough and powerful" accords with the biblical account. This evaluation of Sennacherib's annals would require a more careful study since the versions in the annals vary (cf. Rassam cylinder, Taylor Prism and Bull Inscription 4) and both the reading and the meaning of the expression *šepšu mitru* are far from clear.

The second part of his book bears the title "Hezekiah in the Book of Kings and First Isaiah". In chapter four Y. presents a short review of archaeological and biblical data and concludes that the basic difference between Josiah's and Hezekiah's reform is found in their respective goals. He argues that the former aimed at the extirpation of foreign cults, and the latter at the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem (107-108), which "is never vindicated with recourse to Deuteronomic commandments, but may be explained based entirely on the exigencies of his (Hezekiah's) reign" (119). This claim, however, should be seriously reviewed in the light of the study by L.S. Monroe, who presents a new reconstruction of Josiah's reform (*Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement. Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* [Oxford – New York 2011]). Chapter five is dedicated to the parallel accounts of Hezekiah in 2 Kings 18–19 and Isaiah 36–39. Young summarizes various scholarly positions and suggests that there was an *Urtext* underlying both accounts which was later adapted to the needs of 2 Kings and Isaiah. He furthermore explores the strata of 2 Kings 18–19. On page 140 he slightly modifies the well-known proposal of an annalistic source (A) and prophetic sources (B1 and B2). In chapter six Y. analyses passages chosen from Isaiah 7–11. He provides several important and partially new insights in his analysis of syntax, tenses, vocabulary, literary and historical context. The author concludes that these chapters, even while never mentioning Hezekiah directly, must in fact refer to him, since he is the only suitable candidate to fulfil Isaiah's prophecy.

Part three is dedicated to the image of "Hezekiah in Chronicles". Chapter seven studies 2 Chronicles 29–30 and Y. points out that about

70% of these chapters have no parallel in 2 Kings 18–19; he concludes that it relies on earlier source material. Y. also refuses to dismiss facily the historicity of the Passover as well as the dependence of these chapters on Josiah's reform. In chapter eight Y. studies the sections of 2 Chronicles 31–32 that are proper to the Chronicles. In particular he focuses on the historical assessment of portions and divisions of the cult (2 Chr 31,1-10). Young concludes that this passage reflects pre-exilic usage. Similarly he studies Hezekiah's defensive measures and other achievements in 2 Chr 32,3-6.27-30. In chapter nine Y. investigates the relations between David/Solomon and Hezekiah. He concludes that, whereas "the correspondence David–Hezekiah" was known in the Books of Kings, the correlation between Solomon and Hezekiah became more prominent in the Chronicles. Moreover he summarizes the theories on conditional and unconditional covenant, and he concludes that "the direct correlation between the longevity of the Davidic dynasty and the adherence of its kings to YHWH's ordinances, whether part of Josianic or (post-)exilic redaction, is not thought to have been present while Hezekiah was on the throne" (262).

Young's work is certainly commendable for its thorough and up-dated reviews of recent scholarship on Hezekiah and related issues. He offers excellent summaries of various scholarly positions often accompanied by a well-pondered assessment. In his conclusions he generally accepts solid positions advanced by other scholars. This book is definitely to be recommended to all those who need a solid introduction to 2 Kings 18–19 and related passages. It will serve as a useful guide for readers who can easily lose their way in the jungle of conflicting theories and opinions that are often difficult to assess. Nevertheless, due to the breadth of the issues the author has covered in his book, the reader only occasionally finds an idea that has not been already discussed in other scholarly writings. There are a few new ideas, as for example his proposal of chronology or his insight into a temporal clause in Isa 8,23 (152-56), but they remain buried among the multiple scholarly positions expounded in the discussions or within the ponderous and lengthy footnotes that make the book reader-unfriendly. Moreover, the great variety of issues, ranging from archaeology to literary studies does not permit the author to engage the problems in depth, and his investigations often remain on the level of a discussion of secondary sources without examining seriously the primary sources. For example, his discussion of the "non-imposition of the cult of Aššur" (109-113) does not take into consideration any of the relevant Assyrian documents.

The theme proposed by the title of the book would require a better methodological premise, especially in the light of the proliferating bibliography on innerbiblical analysis, intertextual/intratextual analysis, *Wirkungsgeschichte*, the history of consequences, etc. A more precise definition of his methodology would have allowed the author to choose ap-

appropriate passages for study. As the result of methodological vagueness the author limits himself to the study of 2 Kings 18–19, 2 Chronicles 29–32, and some passages from First Isaiah. He omits other passages in which biblical writers present a different view of Hezekiah, as for example Jer 26,18-19; Proverbs 25–29; 2 Mac 15,22. It could be very helpful to trace the tradition on Hezekiah in the book of Ben Sira 48–49 and in the pseudoapocrypha (cf. 4 Ezd 7,106-111; *Lives of the Prophets* 1; *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* LXIII–LXIV; etc.), as well as in Christian and Jewish commentators. In this regard Y.'s book could have profited greatly from the study of S.D. Ryan, "The Rabshakeh in Late Biblical and Post-Biblical Tradition", *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature: Yearbook 2008* [eds. H. Lichtenberger – U. Mittmann-Richert] [Berlin – New York 2009] 183-195.

In sum, the book represents a good summary of scholarly opinions on "Hezekiah in history". However, the second part "Hezekiah in Tradition" would require further investigation. In that sense, the book remains incomplete and requires further research.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Peter DUBOVSKÝ

Kathleen M. ROCHESTER, *Prophetic Ministry in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 65). Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, Peeters. 2012. xiii-261 p. 15 × 23

Il presente studio è una tesi dottorale, lievemente riveduta dall'autrice, discussa presso la Durham University, UK. È imprescindibile la relazione della dissertazione con la persona che l'ha scritta. Difatti, la Rochester è stata per tanti anni, e lo è ancora, ministro di comunità ecclesiali in Australia, Canada, Gran Bretagna ed Etiopia. Ella ha esercitato il suo ministero mentre studiava e preparava la tesi, così che questa risente molto della sua passione pastorale.

La tesi ha una tematica precisa, svolta con altrettanta chiarezza. Si tratta dello studio comparativo di un set di testi presi dai libri di Geremia e di Ezechiele, al fine di delineare le caratteristiche del rispettivo ministero profetico; in altri termini, somiglianze e differenze e, quindi tipicità del ministero dei due personaggi. L'analisi della R. è "text-centered", cioè non ha la preoccupazione di affrontare questioni storiche, esegetiche o composizionali annose, che pur tuttavia la studiosa conosce, ma che a suo parere non permettono di raggiungere lo scopo che ella si prefigge che è prettamente teologico. Questa sua scelta è confermata dagli autori dai quali si lascia influenzare, B. Childs, il propugnatore dell'interpretazione della Bibbia in contesto canonico, e M. Greenberg, che ha lanciato il ma-

nifesto della lettura olistica del testo biblico. Un altro criterio che orienta lo studio è quello di dare un contributo al contemporaneo “movement of theological interpretation of Scripture” (p. 9), nato per superare un’esegesi troppo razionalistica. Questo tipo di approccio, adottato dalla R., non deve far pensare ad un’analisi semplicistica: l’autrice non è primariamente interessata all’*intentio auctoris*, Geremia o Ezechiele, com’era di prassi nell’esegesi tradizionale, bensì all’*intentio operis*, un criterio squisitamente moderno che tiene conto sia delle acquisizioni delle scienze linguistiche sia dei risultati degli studi sul background storico dei personaggi profetici, perlopiù figure ideali poste al centro di grandi redazioni letterarie. Questo è almeno quanto si propone la R. nell’introduzione.

I testi scelti dall’autrice sono: a) Ger 1,1-19 e Ez 1-3, relativi alla vocazione; b) Ger 6,27-30; 18,1-12 e Ez 33,1-20, dove il ministero profetico viene definito dall’immagine di un lavoratore; c) Ger 7,1-15 e Ez 8-11, entrambi relativi al motivo del tempio di Gerusalemme; d) infine, Ger 23,9-32 e Ez 13, che trattano, a detta dell’autrice, di profeti devianti più che di falsi profeti. L’analisi e il confronto di ciascuna coppia di testi occupa lo spazio di un capitolo. Ogni capitolo si articola nella seguente maniera: analisi esegetica di Ger, analisi esegetica di Ez e infine confronto tra i due.

Per quanto riguarda il primo set di testi, cioè Ger 7,1-15 e Ez 8-11, l’analisi della R. è piana e puntuale; mostra di conoscere i problemi storici e/o redazionali, ma non ama la problematizzazione, così che spesso taglia la discussione con una sua scelta, come nel caso del “trentesimo anno” di Ez 1,1, che ella interpreta come età del profeta o come quando dibatte il problema del mutismo dello stesso Ezechiele (Ez 3,26), per il quale sapientemente sceglie l’interpretazione metaforica, al fine di superare le varie questioni circa il senso, il tempo e il valore di tale mutismo. Il confronto tra le due vocazioni dà come risultato qualcosa che si ripeterà sino alla fine dello studio, cioè, mentre in Geremia prevale la presenza della parola di Dio, in Ezechiele invece ha forte rilievo la visionarietà. Mentre nel primo, il *medium* della parola divina creerebbe un’atmosfera dialogica e intimistica, la coloritura visionaria di Ezechiele darebbe invece l’impressione della potenza annichilatrice di un Dio lontano (metafisicamente parlando).

In Ger 6,27-30; 18,1-12 e Ez 33,1-20, la R. esamina lo svilupparsi della fisionomia del ministero profetico mediante metafore prese dalla vita lavorativa di ogni giorno: per Geremia l’attività del saggiaio di metalli e del vasaio, per Ezechiele quella di sentinella. L’articolazione è la stessa del capitolo precedente, con interessanti spunti esegetici, quale la discussione sull’hapax *bāhôn* = “saggiaio (di metalli)”, per il cui significato preciso l’autrice si spende generosamente con risultato condivisibile. Ella difende il carattere metaforico che dà il tono non solo alle tre figure di “worker”, bensì a tutta la composizione dei due libri profetici. Quanto si ricava dall’analisi è che mentre l’opera che deve condurre Geremia all’ammonizione del suo popolo si assimila a quella stessa di

JHWH, quasi a realizzarla di fatto, il servizio profetico di Ezechiele, invece, è piuttosto passivo e nettamente staccato dall'operazione di Dio. Entrambi i profeti prevedono con le loro parole la possibilità di un cambiamento nel popolo, ma la diversità della situazione storica differenzia anche il senso del cambiamento invocato: per Geremia il popolo dovrebbe farsi modellare dalla parola di Dio, e quindi è una parola di ammonizione e di avviso; per Ezechiele, invece, che già si trova in esilio e ha visto l'arrivo del giudizio, la parola che rivolge al popolo è orientata alla speranza.

Nel capitolo successivo, la R. cerca di definire stavolta le caratteristiche del ministero profetico di Geremia e di Ezechiele in rapporto all'istituzione per eccellenza d'Israele, il tempio. I testi presi in esame sono Ger 7,1-15 e Ez 8-11. Anche qui l'autrice analizza attentamente i testi sottolineando il significato che ha per ciascuno dei due profeti l'istituzione di Gerusalemme. Per entrambi il tempio è la "casa di JHWH", ma, coerentemente con lo stile rispettivo dei due personaggi/libri, il tempio di Geremia è un dato di fatto non ancora toccato dalla distruzione, quindi esso non stimolerebbe alcun potere immaginifico a confronto di quanto avviene per Ezechiele. Il tempio, nel discorso di Geremia, è solo un tema che permette al profeta di richiamare i suoi destinatari a rispettare il vero senso di esso, che è quello di essere la casa del Dio della legge mosaica, cioè del Dio della giustizia e del diritto. Per il sacerdote Ezechiele, invece, pur attento a difendere l'autentico significato del tempio, alla pari di Geremia, si tratta di operare una radicale purificazione di quell'istituzione contaminata dall'idolatria e dal dispregio della legge mosaica.

L'ultimo capitolo della dissertazione tratta dei profeti cosiddetti devianti: Ger 23,9-32 e Ez 13. Anche qui si ha un'analisi puntuale ricca di spunti esegetici e di rilievi propri dell'autrice che conferiscono allo studio un tocco vivace e originale, specialmente in relazione alla presenza delle "profetesse devianti" (Ez 13,17-23). La requisitoria di Geremia contro i falsi profeti, tema fortemente presente nel libro, è, come difende la R., contro pareri diversi, ricca di personale emotività sofferente (e qui la distinzione tra il carattere letterario del testo e l'attribuzione caratteriale al personaggio storico, rispettata altrove dall'autrice, sembra dissolversi). I profeti non sono chiamati in causa in quanto falsi profeti, cioè profeti diremmo noi oggi non validamente "ordinati", ma in quanto usano parole esplicative di loro visioni che partono invece dal loro cuore perverso. Altrettanto si può dire di Ezechiele, il quale però indirizza due oracoli a due distinte categorie di devianti, profeti uomini (13,1-16) e profetesse (13,17-23). Gli uni manipolano la parola parlando per compiacere i destinatari, le altre usano degli strumenti per i quali più che profetesse, termine mai usato per loro nel testo al contrario che per gli uomini (cf. 13,2.17), apparirebbero delle fattucchiere. La R. afferma che il testo riferito a ciascuno dei due gruppi non riterrebbe tanto false le due categorie, quanto piuttosto accuserebbe entrambe di accreditare come parola di Dio una loro parola,

gli uni, gli uomini, attraverso visioni manipolate, le altre, le donne, mediante strumenti devianti non molto chiari, quali potrebbero essere state delle fasce per le braccia o per la testa, polsini o veli per il capo (Ez 13,20-21; cf. pp. 201-204). In altri termini, per l'autrice nel testo biblico le requisitorie non sono rivolte tanto contro l'esistenza di queste due categorie di "operatori", quanto contro la cattiva pratica adoperata. Di Ezechiele ella sottolinea ancora l'uso della potenza delle immagini, a differenza di Geremia. Un'altra differenza sostanziale tra i due profeti sarebbe che mentre Geremia opererebbe come lo stesso JHWH (cf. Ger 1,10), perché ha partecipato al "consiglio di Dio", cioè è stato fatto partecipe della sfera trascendente e quindi eseguirebbe i disegni divini contro le deviazioni, Ezechiele al contrario non denota questa prossimità personale a Dio e sarebbe piuttosto preoccupato di salvaguardare la purezza rituale, la distanza e la distinzione contro ogni contaminazione, infine la santità intangibile di Dio.

La dissertazione si conclude con tre pagine riassuntive dello studio affrontato. Seguono una sostanziosa bibliografia, quasi esclusivamente in lingua inglese, e alcuni utili indici.

Il lavoro della R. è senza dubbio un compito ben pianificato, ben condotto e felicemente portato a termine. Vi è tuttavia un'osservazione critica generale che si potrebbe fare. L'autrice ha scelto di rinunciare a interessarsi a problemi compositivi o redazionali per eseguire un'analisi piana di superficie dei testi selezionati e per poter descrivere quelle che a suo parere sarebbero le caratteristiche del ministero profetico rispettivamente dal punto di vista di Geremia e da quello di Ezechiele. La modalità di lavoro scelta, di tutto rispetto, corre in realtà dei rischi. L'analisi esegetica quasi corsiva di alcuni testi fa dimenticare che essi fanno parte di un piano redazionale ampio e sistematico che detta e orienta delle norme di interpretazione (il messaggio deuteronomico di Geremia, la delineatura dei due profeti come figure ideali, non personalità storiche concrete esprimenti le proprie *ipsissima verba*, natura complessa della redazione del libro di Ezechiele che mette in guardia da osservazioni perentorie isolate). Questo dato è peraltro presente nell'introduzione dell'autrice, ma ella, durante l'analisi esegetica dei singoli passi non sembra tenerne conto e "crea" la personalità di Geremia e quella di Ezechiele, staccate dal piano redazionale totale, così che avremmo davanti un Geremia fortemente mosso da impulsi emotivi e un Ezechiele attento a salvaguardare la purezza rituale. Queste caratteristiche esistono in buona parte nei testi selezionati, ma forse la loro collocazione in un quadro critico redazionale di riferimento avrebbe conferito maggior fondamento e un più profondo spessore esegetico a certe affermazioni teologiche troppo personalizzate.

Ruth POSER, *Das Ezechielbuch als Trauma-Literatur* (VTS 154). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2012. xvii-738 p. 17 × 24. €188 – \$257.00

Es handelt sich bei diesem umfangreichen Band um eine geringfügig überarbeitete Fassung der Dissertationsschrift der Verfasserin, die in Marburg unter der Leitung von Rainer Kessler geschrieben wurde. Das Ezechielbuch unter Gesichtspunkten der Trauma-Forschung zu analysieren und zu interpretieren, ist in der englischsprachigen Forschung bereits mehrfach unternommen worden. Im deutschsprachigen Bereich legt Ruth Poser die erste Monographie zu diesem Thema vor.

In einem ersten Kapitel geht sie kurz auf einige strukturelle und inhaltliche „Befremdlichkeiten“ des Ezechielbuchs ein — wobei es natürlich immer ein wenig subjektiv ist (und beispielsweise auch vom individuellen religiösen Hintergrund abhängt), was einem im AT als „befremdlich“ oder „merkwürdig“ erscheint und was nicht. Ruth Poser nennt hier neben dem Aufbau des Ezechielbuchs und seiner sprachlichen Gestaltung das Bild des Propheten sowie das gewalttätige, emotionslose und egoistische Gottesbild — wobei man m.E. fragen kann, ob in Ezechiel 16 und 23 „JHWH als (sexueller) Gewalttäter“ dargestellt wird — aber auch Phänomene wie Wiederholungen, Wechsel der Redeebenen, Leerstellen, Abbrüche und Inkonsistenzen, die üblicherweise als literarische Stilmittel oder Spuren eines literarischen Wachstums interpretiert werden (2).

Kapitel zwei referiert über „die Befremdlichkeiten des Ezechielbuchs im Spiegel der Forschung“. Den dort bereits vorgeschlagenen Deutungsmodellen (wie etwa der Diagnose einer psychischen Erkrankung Ezechiels oder der Annahme, der Prophet habe in Ekstase, einem „altered state of consciousness“ gesprochen bzw. geschrieben) stellt Kapitel drei das Trauma als „literarhistorisches Sensibilisierungs-, Beschreibungs- und Erkenntnismodell“ zur Seite. Dabei wird relativ breit und informativ über psychotraumatologische, sozialpsychologische, kultur- und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur neueren Traumaforschung referiert.

Kapitel 4 stellt sehr ausführlich „geschichtliche und psychotraumatologische Referenzpunkte des Ezechielbuchs“ aus der einschlägigen Sekundärliteratur zusammen (in zwei Teilkapiteln: „A. Geschichtliche Referenzpunkte des Ezechielbuchs“ und „B. Zum psychotraumatologischen Hintergrund des Ezechielbuchs“). Kapitel 5 kommt dann (249) zum eigentlichen Thema des Bandes: „Das Ezechielbuch als (Trauma-) Literatur“. Hier wird das Genre des Ezechielbuchs als das einer fiktionalen Erzählung bestimmt und festgestellt, dass sich in dieser Erzählung die wesentlichen „Strukturelemente der *trauma response*“ finden, nämlich „*fragmentation, regression und reunification*“.

Mit diesen von Ronald Granofsky übernommenen Termini ist gemeint, „dass sich das Trauma als zersplitterte Erfahrung der Erinnerung immer wieder überfallartig aufdrängt (*fragmentation*), worauf die Betroffenen

mit kindlich anmutenden Verhaltensschemata reagieren (*regression*)”, bis sie nach erfolgter Durcharbeitung des Traumas dieses in ihre Weltsicht integrieren können (*reunification*) (337). Im Ezechielbuch ist nach Ruth Poser “das Moment der *fragmentation* ... von Erzählbeginn an bis Ez 32,16 in starkem Maße vorhanden, verliert gegen Ende der Erzählung aber immer deutlicher an Gewicht. Das Element der *regression* ist ebenfalls durchgehend präsent, gewinnt aber erst zur Buchmitte hin ... höchste Priorität, die es in der Folge zunehmend wieder einbüßt. Aspekte von *reunification* finden sich zunächst nur in geringer Ausprägung und punktuell, um sich in Ez 33,21 – 39,29 und noch deutlicher in Ez 40,1 – 48,35 in den Vordergrund zu schieben” (338f).

Die Deutung des Ezechielbuchs als “trauma response” wird sodann in einer “kursorische[n] Lektüre mit Vertiefungen” im knapp 300 Seiten umfassenden Kapitel sechs etwas detaillierter vorgeführt. Eine nochmals knapp 40 Seiten umfassende “Schlussbetrachtung” fasst die in diesem Band vertretene Sicht des Ezechielbuchs “in trauma-t(he)ologischer Perspektive” zusammen.

Es ist kaum möglich, einem derart umfangreichen Werk in einer kurzen Rezension gerecht zu werden. Trotzdem seien hier ein paar kritische Anmerkungen notiert.

Der Verfasserin ist am “Zusammenhalt von literaturwissenschaftlicher ... und sozialgeschichtlicher ... Lesart” (4) alttestamentlicher Texte gelegen. Für letztere wäre aber eine sorgfältigere Evaluation des historischen Quellenwerts des Ezechielbuchs notwendig gewesen, als sie die Verfasserin bietet. In der heutigen Forschungslage muss die Annahme einer (weitgehenden) literarischen Einheitlichkeit eines Textes ebenso gut begründet werden wie die einer mehr oder weniger differenzierten redaktionellen Schichtung. Den “Endtext” (welchen?) des Ezechielbuchs ohne genauere Analyse im Großen und Ganzen als Quelle für das 6. Jahrhundert heranzuziehen, ist angesichts der textlich belegten verschiedenen redaktionellen Bearbeitungen (p967, LXX, MT) schon recht gewagt — auch wenn Ruth Poser nicht die einzige ist, die das tut.

Eine genauere Rekonstruktion der Entstehungsgeschichte des Ezechielbuchs hätte vielleicht auch dazu helfen können, die von Ruth Poser immer wieder registrierten unterschiedlichen Reaktionen auf traumatische Erfahrungen im Ezechielbuch (von emotionalen Ausbrüchen bis hin zu kühlen Reflexionen) im Rahmen einer geschichtlichen Entwicklung der Verarbeitung des Exiltraumas zu verstehen.

In ihrer Schlussbetrachtung stellt Ruth Poser fest: “Insgesamt spiegelt das Ezechielbuch ein Doppeltes wider: Ein traumatisches, fast irrational zu nennendes Schuldempfinden auf der einen, ein differenzierte(re)s, am Maßstab der Tora JHWHs orientiertes Nachdenken über Schuld und Verantwortung vor allem der gesellschaftlichen Eliten auf der anderen Seite”. Davon sei ersteres typisch für Trauma-Überlebende (644).

Würde das nicht die Überlegung nahe legen, dass im Ezechielbuch Texte enthalten sein könnten, die den "traumatischen" Erfahrungen von 587/6 näher oder ferner stehen? Und böte es sich dann nicht an, diesen Befund z.B. mit der redaktionsgeschichtlichen Rekonstruktion Karl-Friedrich Pohlmanns zu vergleichen, nach der am Anfang der Entwicklung des Ezechielbuchs Texte standen, denen es darum ging "Artikulationsmöglichkeiten zu schaffen für diejenigen, die im Lande die Katastrophe und damit den Verlust des bisherigen theologischen Ordnungshorizontes erfahren hatten" (*Der Prophet Hesekiel/Ezechiel* [ATD 22.1; Göttingen 1996] 38)?

Ruth Poser spricht davon, dass "sowohl JHWH als auch Israel im Verlauf der Erzählung Entwicklungen durchmachen". So nimmt z.B. "JHWH ... letztlich Abstand von strafendem Handeln und (traumatischer) Raserei" und versucht stattdessen, die Israeliten durch beschämende Wohltaten und die Gabe eines neuen Herzens und eines neuen Geistes zu einer Verbesserung ihres Verhaltens zu bewegen (680). Die entsprechenden Texte sind allerdings im Buch so verteilt (in Ezechiel 6; 11; 20; 36), dass man m.E. nicht von einer Entwicklung "im Verlauf der Erzählung" sprechen kann, sondern höchstens davon, dass Jahwe die Katastrophe herbeiführt, obwohl er längst wissen müsste, dass sie nicht die erwünschte Wirkung haben wird und es einen besseren Weg gäbe, diese Wirkung zu erreichen.

Auch bei einer mehr flächigen ("synchronen") Betrachtung des Ezechielbuchs hätte m.E. etwas stärker berücksichtigt werden können, dass es sich in Ezechiel 1–24 fast durchgängig um Drohungen an die nach 597 in Jerusalem und Juda Zurückgebliebenen handelt, welche die erste Gola nicht einschließen, sie gelegentlich vielmehr ausdrücklich ausschließen.

Ruth Poser weist beispielsweise in ihrer Auslegung von Ezechiel 7 darauf hin, dass die "über weite Strecken traumatisch anmutende Schilderung ... innerhalb des Plots der Ezechiel Erzählung nicht als (nachträglicher) menschlicher fiktionaler (Augen-) Zeugenbericht" erscheint, sondern "JHWH als Ankündigung seines Tages in den Mund gelegt" wird (305). In traumatologischer Hinsicht entspricht dies ihrer Meinung nach dem "Phänomen der traumatischen Schuldübernahme ... Schuld wird übernommen, weil dies leichter erträglich und lebensförderlicher sein kann als das hilflose, ohnmächtige Ausgeliefertsein an eine willkürliche feindliche Macht" (308).

Das ist aber "innerhalb des Plots der Ezechiel Erzählung" m.E. keineswegs sicher. Ezechiel 7 richtet sich ja ausdrücklich an das Land (Israel) und seine Bewohner, schließt also die 597 Exilierten nicht ein. Wollen diese hier nicht eher ihre (Mit-) Verantwortung für die Ereignisse von 587/6 auf die in der Heimat Zurückgebliebenen abschieben?

Ruth Posers Vorentscheidung, das Ezechielbuch 'synchron' einheitlich als ein Dokument des (früheren) 6. Jahrhunderts zu lesen, führt auch dazu, dass sie praktisch keine Überlegungen darüber anstellt, wie man im

Ezechielbuch Texte, die traumatische Erfahrungen verarbeiten, von solchen unterscheiden kann, die das nicht tun — denn als Texte Ezechiels müssen ja alle Texte des Buches dessen traumatische Erfahrungen widerspiegeln. So ist man sich als Leser oder Leserin manchmal unsicher, ob “traumatische Strukturen” jeweils aus den Texten heraus- oder in sie hineingelesen werden.

Am Ende von Kap. 3 zählt Ruth Poser eine Reihe von “Merkmale(n) und Kennzeichen trauma-bearbeitender Literatur” auf (114ff.), von “repetitive(n) Strukturen”, “Leerstellen und (Ab-) Brüche(n)” (114f.) bis zur Abfolge von “fragmentation”, “regression” und “reunification” (119, s.o.). Die zuerst genannten sind sicher keine eindeutigen Kennzeichen, die zuletzt genannten sind im Ezechielbuch m.E. nicht so klar und eindeutig zu erkennen, wie Ruth Poser meint. So gewinnt man insgesamt den Eindruck, dass sich das Ezechielbuch in gewissen Hinsichten und gewissen Teilen als “trauma-bearbeitende Literatur” lesen und verstehen lässt, dass damit aber (noch?) kein Schlüssel für das Verständnis dieses merkwürdigen, gerade deshalb aber auch so faszinierenden und theologisch inspirierenden Buches gewonnen ist.

Am Ende des Bandes wirft Ruth Poser noch einmal einen “Blick auf die in der Einleitung skizzierten Wunderlichkeiten des Ezechielbuchs” (679). “Dass JHWH immer wieder als Gewalttäter inszeniert wird (bzw. sich selbst als solcher inszeniert)”, ist letztlich ebenso eine “Folge der traumatischen Katastrophe von 587/86 v.u.Z. bzw. der mit dieser Katastrophe verbundenen individuellen und kollektiven Gewalterfahrungen” wie der Gedanke an eine “inhärent erscheinende Sündhaftigkeit des Hauses Israel und dessen scheinbare Unfähigkeit zu toragemäßigem, lebensförderlichen Handeln” (ebd.). Doch ist dieses Gottes- und Menschenbild nach Ruth Posers Ansicht “nicht nur traumatisch, sondern auch ... heilsam” (679f.), insofern es als literarische Fiktion dazu beitragen kann, die ihm zu Grunde liegenden traumatischen Erfahrungen zu verarbeiten. Vielleicht zeigt sich ja auch die Wahrheit am ehesten, wenn alle scheinbaren Gewissheiten zerbrechen?

Universität Zürich
Theologisches Seminar
Kantonsschulstraße 1
Ch-8001 Zürich

Thomas KRÜGER

Judith GÄRTNER, *Die Geschichtspsalmen*. Eine Studie zu den Psalmen 78, 105, 106, 135 und 136 als hermeneutische Schlüsseltexte im Psalter (FAT 84). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. xiv-439 p. 16 × 24. €109.

La monografia di J. Gärtner corrisponde alla sua Habilitationsschrift, redatta sotto la direzione di F. Hartenstein e presentata all'università protestante di teologia di Monaco di Baviera nel 2012. Lo studio si pone in linea con la recente ricerca “canonica” del salterio, sulla scia del cono-

sciuto commento di Hossfeld – Zenger. A differenza dagli studi condotti in area inglese, lo studio attuale del salterio in area tedesca sottolinea, accanto alla dimensione “compositiva” del salterio, anche quella “redazionale” (vedi, in questo senso, oltre ai due autori sopra citati, gli studi di Leuenberger, Kratz, Hartenstein, Levin), sicché il libro pretende “aprire nuove prospettive sull’origine e sulla teologia del salterio” (dalla presentazione in copertina).

Il tema scelto, i cosiddetti “salmi storici” (Salmi 78; 105; 106; 135; 136), costituiscono quantitativamente una parte notevole del salterio, e posta, come opportunamente sottolinea l’autrice, in punti chiave del libro, cioè al centro dei salmi di Asaf (Salmi 73–83), alla fine del quarto libro (Salmi 90–106) e alla fine di un precedente stadio redazionale del salterio (Salmi 2–136*).

Lo studio ha due risvolti: uno riguarda i singoli salmi, il loro profilo teologico; l’altro la composizione del salterio, cioè lo studio del loro contesto immediato, in cui la componente diacronica, cioè lo studio del divenire del salterio, gioca, come dicevamo, un ruolo notevole.

Diamo un breve riassunto del contenuto. In un primo capitolo l’autrice fa il punto sulla ricerca, notando il passaggio da un interesse di tipo storico (Kühlewein, Kreuzer) a uno di tipo prevalentemente teologico (Mathys, Mathias, Pröbstl). Quindi sviluppa il suo approccio, fondandolo sugli studi recenti sul ruolo della memoria come costitutiva dell’identità culturale di un popolo. Particolarmente sottolineato è il contributo di E. Voegelin (*Ordnung und Geschichte* [edd. P. Opitz – J. Herz], Vol. 2: *Israel und die Offenbarung – Die Geburt der Geschichte* [edd. F. Hartenstein – J. Jeremias][München 2005]). In questa prospettiva la storia primitiva di Israele diviene un paradigma per la comprensione del presente. Quindi gli stessi fatti si aprono a interpretazioni diverse, a seconda delle diverse circostanze storiche in cui vengono ricordati.

Il primo capitolo è dedicato al Salmo 78. G. studia il salmo anzitutto in se stesso, delineandone la struttura fondamentale, e facendo un’esegesi corsiva dei singoli versetti. Essa scorge nel salmo, al di là del proemio (vv. 1–11), un doppio itinerario storico: vv. 12–39 e 40–72. Il tema centrale è la misericordia di Dio (cf. vv. 38–39), che mette un argine alla sua ira, causata dalle continue infedeltà di Israele. In un secondo momento l’autrice situa il salmo nella raccolta di Asaf. Vengono studiati i contatti con i due salmi vicini, il precedente Salmo 77 e il successivo Salmo 79, quindi quelli con i restanti salmi della raccolta, di cui, secondo G., il Salmo 78 costituisce il centro. Stranamente però non vengono esaminati tutti i salmi di Asaf (Salmi 73–83), ma i più legati al Salmo 78, cioè, oltre ai Salmi 77–79, i Salmi 74; 75; 76. A giudizio di G., la raccolta è composta di due archi compositivi, ciascuno di tre salmi: 74–76 e 77–79. Il rapporto con gli altri salmi non viene chiarito.

Secondo G., i due salmi 105 e 106 costituiscono una coppia di “salmi gemelli”. Essa intitola così il capitolo ad essi dedicato: “il grande *parallelismus membrorum* della storia della salvezza”. Come nel capitolo pre-

cedente, i due salmi vengono anzitutto studiati individualmente, il Salmo 105 contrassegnato dalla fedeltà di Dio all'alleanza con il suo popolo, il Salmo 106 come riflessione sul rapporto tra la misericordia di Dio e la "dimenticanza" del popolo. La conclusione del Salmo 106 (vv. 44-46) è una ripresa della formula della grazia di Es 34,6-7 filtrata attraverso Gl 2,13 e Gn 4,2. Come in Es 34,6-7, la formula della grazia viene presentata come esegesi del nome santo, JHWH (v. 47). Il passo successivo è quello di chiarire il legame dei salmi 105 e 106 tra loro. L'autrice nota, al di là delle scarse corrispondenze lessematiche, una costruzione concettuale quasi parallela: la stessa storia viene ripercorsa due volte, una volta per mettere in luce la fedeltà di Dio, un'altra per evidenziare l'infedeltà di Israele, ma alla fine la misericordia di Dio ha l'ultima parola. Questo accento sulla misericordia, è, a dire di G., il motivo di fondo dei salmi finali del IV libro. A questo proposito l'autrice inserisce uno studio del Salmo 103, riconoscendo in esso la stessa mano che ha composto i Salmi 105 e 106. Anche i Salmi 104 e 107 vengono attribuiti alla stessa redazione.

Il quarto capitolo è dedicato allo studio di altri due "salmi gemelli": 135 e 136. La dipendenza, secondo G., è dal Salmo 136 al Salmo 135: quest'ultimo sarebbe una "variazione" sul Salmo 136. Anche qui, i due salmi vengono studiati prima ciascuno per sé, nella loro struttura e nei paralleli con gli altri testi dell'AT (particolarmente numerosi nel caso del Salmo 145). In un secondo momento l'autrice studia il contesto di questo dittico, proponendo di considerare i due salmi come conclusione provvisoria del salterio, notandone gli addentellati sia con i Salmi delle ascensioni sia con quelli dell'Hallel pasquale, in particolare con il Salmo 115, al cui parallelo con il Salmo 135 l'autrice dedica uno studio particolare. Come controprova, i legami dei Salmi 135-136 con i salmi seguenti sono poco rilevanti. Anche in questo caso G. riscontra la dominanza del tema della misericordia (si veda il ritornello del Salmo 136), che qui sarebbe celebrata per se stessa, senza legame con il peccato dell'uomo come nei precedenti salmi storici.

Nel capitolo conclusivo, l'autrice trae le conclusioni dalla sua ricerca. Dal punto di vista teologico, oltre alla "formula della grazia", essa sottolinea altri temi correlati. Il tema, anzitutto, del monoteismo, collegato con la dimensione universale ed esclusiva del Dio di Israele, quindi quello ad esso parallelo dell'unione tra creazione e storia della salvezza. Essa sottolinea l'importanza della "memoria" nella costituzione dell'identità di Israele. Dal punto di vista redazionale, i salmi storici si rivelano essere tra i più tardivi del salterio, quindi anche quelli che più aiutano a cogliere l'intenzione del redattore finale.

L'autrice analizza con competenza ed acribia una massa considerevole di passi biblici non solo del salterio, ma anche dei testi correlati dell'AT. L'intertestualità si rivela strada maestra in questo studio. L'analisi delle strutture è accurato: non indulge a bizantinismi, ma va all'essenziale. Allo stesso tempo, l'apertura all'indagine antropologica sulla memoria si rivela partico-

larmente feconda. Alla fine della lettura, il revisore è rimasto convinto della bontà e fondatezza della ricerca attuale sul salterio in quanto libro. Forse, pur riconoscendo la legittimità e la serietà dello studio diacronico, egli si augurerebbe una maggior attenzione al testo finale. In fondo le redazioni precedenti hanno un carattere ipotetico e, dal punto di vista teologico, pre-canonico. Lo sforzo maggiore andrebbe rivolto, a mio avviso, al testo definitivo.

Per ciò che riguarda l'esegesi particolare, qualche perplessità suscita la sottolineatura del carattere collettivo della figura di Davide in Sal 78,70-72 ("Zugleich schließt sie [= il concetto di Davide come pastore] das gesamte Volk mit ein", 98), anche perché spesso, nei recenti studi, si tende a negare un carattere individuale alla figura di "Davide" negli ultimi libri del salterio. Nel caso del Salmo 78, dipende da come questa "inclusione" viene intesa. Va salvata, a mio avviso, la distinzione tra le due realtà, quella individuale della guida, e quella collettiva del popolo: al riguardo i vv. 71-72 sono espliciti. Del resto, dell'elezione di Giuda si parlava al v. 68, quindi si tratta di due elezioni diverse.

Perplessità suscita in me anche l'identificazione dei יְרֵאִי יְהוָה di Sal 135,20; 115,11.13; 118,4) con i proseliti (336-337 e *passim*). La cosa è per lo meno discutibile e discussa (cf. H.H. Fuhs, "יְרֵאִי, *järe*", *ThWAT* III, 888; anche M. Mark, *Meine Stärke und mein Schutz ist der Herr: Poetologisch-theologische Studie zu Psalm 118* [FB 92; Würzburg 1999] 345-351). Negli altri passi l'espressione non indica membri dei "popoli", ma del popolo di Israele, una sorte di élite spirituale del popolo (cf. Mal 3,16; Sal 15,4 e 22,24, a cui si possono accostare le espressioni sinonimiche di Es 18,21; Mal 3,20; Sal 61,6; 66,16). Particolarmente istruttivo è il parallelo con Sal 22,24, perché qui al sacrificio di ringraziamento per la salvezza del povero vengono invitati anzitutto i poveri di Israele (vv. 23-27), definiti come יְרֵאִי יְהוָה (v. 24, cf. 26), quindi i ricchi pagani (vv. 28-30). Come nel Salmo 22, anche nei Salmi 115; 118 e 135 la dimensione universale è certamente presente, ma viene nello stesso tempo sottolineata la funzione particolare di Israele, che deve raccontare ai popoli le meraviglie che Dio ha compiuto "per noi" (Sal 117,1-2, cf. Sal 100,2-3).

A proposito del Salmo 103 l'autrice, rifacendosi alle valutazioni di Spieckermann e Zenger, individua una differenza sostanziale rispetto a Es 34,6-7, nel senso che mentre in quest'ultimo passo la formula della grazia ingloba anche la dimensione della punizione e dell'"ira", tale dimensione sarebbe assente dal Salmo 103 (268-269). Questa differenza mi sembra forzata, dal momento che anche Sal 103,8-10 rileva la dimensione dell'ira nel comportamento di JHWH, e d'altronde anche in Es 34,6-7 la misericordia la supera e la ingloba. Si spiega così la reazione positiva di Mosè in Es 34,8-9, che chiede di concludere l'alleanza con un Dio che sa perdonare. Si tratta, a mio avviso, più di sfumatura che di sostanza. È che anche in Es 34,6-7, non meno che nel Salmo 103, la formula della grazia risente dell'esperienza della distruzione di Gerusalemme e dell'esilio.

Si tratta di osservazioni particolari, e aperte a discussione. Il revisore ribadisce l'impressione largamente positiva suscitata in lui dalla ricerca di J. Gärtner, che rappresenta a suo avviso un contributo notevole alla conoscenza della genesi e della teologia del salterio. Vorrei riprendere una suggestione del libro, sottolineando l'espressione del Salmo 78 che l'autrice gli pone a conclusione: gli "indovinelli del tempo antico" (*Rätsel der Vorzeit*, Sal 78,2). A conferma della "concatenazione" tra Salmo 77 e Salmo 78 vorrei accostargli l'espressione: "Le sue orme non sono state conosciute" (Sal 77,20). Ambedue i passi invitano, come fanno i salmi storici, a ripercorrere sempre di nuovo il cammino di Dio con il suo popolo, per penetrarne il mistero.

Via Appia Antica, 102
I-00179 Roma

Gianni BARBIERO

Novum Testamentum

Dennis R. MACDONALD, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels*. The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord (Early Christianity and Its Literature 8). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. xv-711 p. 15 × 23. \$69.95

Whoever thought that the Synoptic problem was solved forever was wrong. The most popular solution, the *Two Source* theory, is useful heuristically, but does not resolve all problems, nor do the other proposals. The issue is multifaceted. Dennis MacDonald's *Two Shipwrecked Gospels* proposes a complex, innovative solution to the Synoptic problem; it has all the potential to guide future scholars in resolving the issue. The title of the book refers to two Gospels shipwrecked, that is, lost and survived only by some fragments in quotations of ancient authors. These lost Gospels are Papias's five-volume *Exposition of Logia about the Lord*, attested in a few citations by Eusebius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Philip of Side, Andrew of Caesarea and John of Scythopolis; and *The Logoi of Jesus*, or the expanded Q (Q+). Q+ is identified as a work that Papias (*Hist. Eccl.* 3,39,16) wrongly assumed to be a variant translation of a Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel. If this were true, then Papias would have had two differing Greek copies of the *logia* that he mistook to be independent translations of a Semitic original. One of these was Matthew's Gospel, and the other Q+, an expanded collection of sayings and stories. According to MacDonald's hypothesis, Q+ was used by the three authors of the canonical Gospels. Papias indicated the sources known to him, and Luke and John were apparently not among them. MacDonald thinks that Luke was written in the early second century, and Luke's reference to many who wrote before him should be interpreted as his having had access not only to Mark and the "Matthean" Gospels but also to Papias' *Exposition*; Papias' influence can be witnessed in Luke 1,1-4 and Acts 1,12-26. For the rest of his Gospel, Luke used Matthew, Mark and Q. MacDonald considers the agreements of Luke and Matthew (against Papias) as an indication of Luke's knowledge of Matthew (Matt 27,3-10 || Acts 1,15-26; Luke 1,79 || Matt 4,16; Luke 22,63-64 || Matt 26,67-68). Several diagrams in the book illustrate the interconnections between the sources (xv; 67), especially the intertextual map to the Q+/Papias Hypothesis (89). This hypothesis consists in: a) Markan priority: Mark was the earliest synoptic Gospel, and served as a source to Matthew and Luke; b) the existence of a lost Gospel: Matthew redacted at least another Gospel, now lost, namely Matthew's Q; c) Mark's knowledge of the lost Gospel: the Markan evangelist knew the same document that informed Matthew; d) Papias's knowledge of Mark, Matthew and the lost Gospel

that sufficiently resembled Matthew, that he took it to be a second Greek translation of Matthew's original; e) Luke's knowledge of Papias's *Exposition* and thus also of Mark, Matthew and the lost Gospel. It would appear that Luke redacted these earlier books about Jesus sequentially, generally preferring Mark to Q, and Q to Matthew. Luke consulted Papias for his preface, Matthew for the infancy narrative, Mark for Jesus' ministry in Galilee, the lost Gospel for Jesus' teaching; further, Mark for the passion narrative, Matthew for Jesus' post-resurrection appearances, and Papias for a few episodes in the Acts of the Apostles.

The second part of the book reconstructs the *Logoi of Jesus* (Q+). Instead of beginning with the agreements between Matthew and Luke, as reconstructions of Q usually do, MacDonald compares Mark and Matthew and scrupulously avoids Luke-Acts, for both authors knew and redacted the same lost Gospel. In Part II, Chap. 4, MacDonald offers six criteria for assessing which details in which of the Gospels represent the earliest version of a tradition (96-97). With these criteria, he searches for sayings that express "inverted priority", that is, sayings that appear to be tradition-historically prior to Mark's version. In a first step, he identifies Matthew's "minimal Q", which is more primitive than the parallel version of Mark. This "minimal Q" contains Matt 5,15.18.23-24.29-30.32; 7,1-2; 10,23.26-27.32-33.34-35.38-39.40; 11,10; 12,30.32.38-39; 17,20; 18,6-7; 20,16; 21,32; 24,26.43-44; 25,29. Henceforth the author elaborates an "expanded Matthew", which does not consist of creations of the Matthew redaction but is congruent with the "minimal Q", thus incorporating the majority of Q texts, including the Markan, although Matthew preserves a more primitive tenor of the text (Matt 12,1-8.9-13; 13,3-11.13; 15,1-11).

Chapter 5, "the *Logoi of Jesus* (Q+) and its Antetexts" (171-409), is the heart of the reconstruction insofar as it integrates the *logia* in Luke-Acts and attempts to reconstruct the order and even the wording of the lost Gospel. It constitutes the full reconstruction of Q+ with an original sequence for the Gospel, placing the mission instruction at the end. This chapter also highlights the intertextual relations between Q+ and several texts of the Hebrew Bible: Q+ is patterned on texts from Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel which it echoes.

The reconstruction of Q+ is much broader than the Q of the *Critical Edition* and contains much more material than other reconstructions of Q. Overall, Q+ is more like a narrative Gospel than a sayings collection. "The *Logoi of Jesus* was not a loose assortment of traditional sayings clumsily gathered into speeches: it was a strategic rewriting of Deuteronomy with a coherent and compelling structure and plot ... it is not a narrative such as one finds in the Synoptics, but it is a narrative nonetheless... The *Logoi of Jesus* was a sophisticated literary accomplishment" (512). Some of the texts included in it will surprise the reader, especially the text of the woman caught in adultery, for it is an interpolation in John's gospel,

and does not appear in the Synoptics. The proposed order for Q+ is random, then; it does not correspond to any of the Gospels.

Chapters 6–10 explore related topics such as the literary characteristics of the reconstruction (chap. 6), *Logoi* as Papias's second putative translation of Matthew (chap. 7), and the lost Gospel as a source for the Gospel of Mark (chap. 8). The book also discusses the relevance of the Q+/Papias Hypothesis to the Son of Man problem and research on the historical Jesus. With respect to the former, MacDonald argues that Jesus never referred to himself as the Son of Man. The origin of the title lies in the literary imagination of the *Logoi*'s author, who found the contrasting use of the title in Ezekiel and Daniel as inspiration for Jesus' evolution from the rejected prophet to the recipient of the Kingdom of God. With respect to the latter, the *Logoi* is our earliest witness to Jesus' teaching (before 66–70 or during the war), is composed in Greek, and the frequency of Semitic loanwords alludes to a bilingual environment; hence it is a book of the Galilean Jesus movement. The final chapter offers suggestions as to why the *Logoi of Jesus* and Papias's *Exposition* were shipwrecked. Since these texts were important (and Papias' text apparently survived for centuries), their loss cannot be considered accidental: "The problem with the lost Gospel was not that its theology was inadequate; it was that some of Jesus' predictions were flat wrong" (556). Just as the *Logoi* of Jesus may have ceased circulating because of its errant eschatology, Eusebius may have considered the *Exposition* similarly flawed. Papias' eschatology became unacceptable. It may have been the inclusion of such material in the canonical books attributed to the apostolic age that led to the loss not only of Q+ and Papias' exposition but also of Ariston's *Expositions of the Logoi of the Lord*.

This is a very inspiring book; it has handled thoroughly a lot of details on the synoptic problem, identifying the weaknesses of old paradigms and opening up new fields of discussion and research on the interrelationship among the Gospels and between other ancient documents. It is certainly an important work which challenges the spread of Q as well as the materials attributed to this lost source. However, the hypothesis also raises many questions difficult to solve: why did Mark modify so much of Q+, even to eliminate several unfulfilled predictions? Was it due to the Gentile mission? Many scholars will question the argument defending Luke's knowledge of Matthew. Also questionable is the attribution of so much Markan material to Q, for it raises issues related to Mark's compositional practice, which the hypothesis does not solve. Undoubtedly the book is a tribute to Q; it explains how Matthew and Luke can at times preserve earlier versions of their overlapping material instead of the later versions. There are some small mistakes (59: Agrippa II).

Beth M. STOVELL, *Mapping Metaphorical Discourse in the Fourth Gospel* (Linguistic Biblical Studies 5). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2012. xv-381 p. 16 × 24. €146 - \$203.

Cette monographie publie la révision d'une dissertation doctorale sous la direction de S. E. Porter et de M. J. Boda au McMaster Divinity College (Hamilton, Ontario), soutenue en août 2012. Le sous-titre: *John's Eternal King*, indique son objet, soit l'étude du Roi Éternel selon Jean.

Le chapitre I (1-28) introduit à la question de la royauté dans l'évangile de Jean, son traitement contrasté chez les Synoptiques et Jean, la manière de l'envisager sous l'angle de la métaphore. "Cette approche veut éviter la totalisation de la métaphore, d'un côté, en démontrant comment plusieurs métaphores qui fonctionnent dans leur propre ligne sont aussi liées à la royauté, sans pour autant assumer que la royauté soit la métaphore centrale dans l'évangile de Jean. Cette approche veut éviter l'atomisation de la métaphore, de l'autre côté, en incorporant l'étude de ces autres mélanges métaphoriques dans l'étude de la royauté, tout en évitant par-là l'éclatement de métaphores" (24-25). La thèse soutient ainsi que "le thème de Jésus comme roi fournit un des thèmes unifiant du message global de Jean en mêlant métaphores familiale, pastorale, sensorielle et judiciaire à la métaphore de Jésus comme roi" du début à la fin de l'évangile (25). Le recours à une théorie interdisciplinaire de la métaphore incorpore des éléments d'approche linguistique fonctionnelle cognitive et systémique comme des éléments d'approches littéraires au cours d'un copieux chapitre II: "Waterskiing across metaphor's surface: a Linguistic and Literary Metaphor Theory" (29-71). La clarté de l'exposition séduit, compte tenu des sujets abordés en philosophie, en linguistique et en théorie littéraire. Grâce à une érudition limpide, sans prétention mais avec conviction, cet apparent détour renouvelle la problématique, trop souvent réductrice ou simplificatrice en ces matières.

Le chapitre III: "God is King: metaphors of Kingship in the Hebrew Bible" (63-133), brosse ensuite un panorama remarquable de la recherche sur cet argument. Il embrasse des textes de la Torah, des livres historiques, des Psaumes et des Prophètes, retenus comme significatifs pour opérer le lien avec l'évangile johannique. "La loi du roi" est choisie en Dt 17,14-20, "l'onction de David comme roi" en 1 Samuel 16, "le transfert du pouvoir royal de Saül à David" en 2 Samuel 1, avec l'importance de la couronne et du brassard royal; "métaphores royales et attenantes dans l'alliance davidique" en 2 Samuel 7, avec des ramifications pour la construction du temple et de la "maison" de David, le "Père-Roi et Fils-Roi", le "Pasteur et Serviteur: le roi en dépendance du Grand Roi"; "le nom du roi et le nom du Grand Roi". "Royauté humaine et divine" sont traitées en 2 Samuel 22: rocher, bouclier et salut (vv. 2-17), Yahweh, le Divin Guerrier, et lampes, tonnerres, illuminations (vv. 13-16.29), David et l'Oint de Yahweh (v. 51).

Une part importante est ensuite accordée aux Psaumes du règne de David, avec un centrage sur les Psaumes 2, 72, 89, 118 et 146. Le Psaume 2 est traité sous l'angle du Roi Oint en lien avec les rois et les princes de la terre. Le Psaume 72, quant à lui, valorise le rapport entre les rois divin et humains et la justice. Le Psaume 89 sert au questionnement du Grand Roi à propos du roi davidique. Le Psaume 118 examine le lien entre le roi qui vient et le Nom du Seigneur. Le Psaume 146 revient sur l'Éternel Roi de justice. Avec pédagogie et une admirable maîtrise de l'information, chaque grande section se conclut par une synthèse. Elle aide le lecteur à engranger les résultats acquis par la traversée des textes, sans laisser se perdre le fil de l'investigation, au service du quatrième évangile. Chez les prophètes, Isaïe 42 et Isaïe 55 sont prélevés au début et à la fin du Deuxième Isaïe. Ezechiel 34 valorise le jugement des pasteurs par Yahweh, le Pasteur par excellence, le jugement des brebis du troupeau et le pasteur davidique dans son rapport à l'alliance de paix. Zacharie 9 et 10 font à leur tour l'objet d'un examen du même réseau conceptuel et métaphorique, toujours du point de vue de la royauté. L'étude des textes, sans négliger la diachronie, privilégie la synchronie qui met en évidence la dépendance d'une métaphore sur Dieu par rapport aux autres. La sélection se veut au service de l'intertextualité, jamais abstraite, dans la traversée des textes, avec recul critique suffisant sans être envahissant. Une magnifique leçon de ce que l'on pourrait appeler une *lectio divina* soucieuse d'une théologie qui ne fasse jamais l'impasse sur le sens de "la lettre". À travers l'étude linguistique et littéraire des métaphores, les textes vibrent, s'interpellent et s'éclairent dans le respect d'opinions interprétatives souvent contrastées pour ne pas dire contradictoires, levées grâce à l'horizon visé du Nouveau Testament. Le champ est immense et gratifiant. Il aurait encore pu être complété, surtout par une dame, épouse et mère de famille, grâce à l'apport de la Sagesse "parèdre", "qui siège sur le trône du roi", dans la littérature sapientielle jusque dans le livre de la Sagesse. Cet appoint n'aurait pas été sans signification pour le lien entre Jésus, le Fils, et sa mère dans le quatrième évangile, toujours du point de vue de la royauté. Une piste se trouve ainsi toute tracée pour des approfondissements ultérieurs. Il se pourrait que l'axe de la filiation divine et de la médiation sacerdotale qui la prolonge s'en trouve raffermi par rapport à la royauté du Fils. Peut-être cette lacune provient-elle d'opinions confessionnelles sur cette littérature qui déborde "la Bible hébraïque". Toujours est-il que le champ est désormais aménagé pour les trois chapitres consacrés à honorer la problématique méthodologique et biblique assurée par les chapitres précédents.

La chapitre IV: "The Anointed King: Messiah and Kingship in John 1" (135-180), donne le ton, en n'hésitant pas à entrer dans des problèmes de détails, solubles à l'aide de l'approche proposée, comme le choix de la leçon: "L'Élu de Dieu", préférée au "Fils de Dieu", en Jn 1,34 (140-141). L'accumulation de titres appliqués à Jésus en Jn 1,19-51 fournit le pro-

gramme du récit. “Le commencement des signes” en Jn 2,1-12 au terme de ce parcours inaugural aurait encore pu manifester l’importance de la métaphore nuptiale pour compléter la symbolique, toujours dans la ligne sapientielle (Proverbes 8–9; Siracide 24; Cantique). En tout état de cause: impossible de séparer les uns des autres ces titres complémentaires: “l’Élu de Dieu”, “le Fils de Dieu”, “le Roi d’Israël” et “le Fils de l’homme”. L’analyse du discours passe le texte au peigne fin, suivie par l’analyse des métaphores mêlées. Ces procédures accomplies, une flèche est lancée vers la conclusion du chapitre 20,31, à travers la confession de foi de Marthe en Jn 11,27; à ce sujet, les critères de découpage auraient pu être affinés. “Le caractère de Jésus comme roi est conditionné par sa capacité à donner la vie” (173). En ressort un des acquis majeurs de cet ouvrage remarquable. Dès son ouverture, Beth M. Stovell déplore une spiritualisation excessive du royaume et de la royauté de Dieu dans l’évangile johannique réduite à deux occurrences en Jn 3,3.5. Cette dimension serait relayée par son substitut de “vie éternelle”. Mais c’est au prix d’un appauvrissement de Jean par rapport aux Synoptiques sur une question majeure du Nouveau Testament, mise en valeur par les études sur le “Jésus historique”. Cette constellation de métaphores au sujet de Jésus Roi chez Jean révèle une approche autre que celle des Synoptiques. “Dans l’évangile de Jean une continuité existe entre le royaume de Dieu et la royauté de Jésus qui reflète l’impact de la Bible hébraïque sur l’horizon spirituel (*mindset*) johannique” (178). Cela nous fait accéder à une “christologie haute”, sans préjudice à son enracinement humain, historique et même politique. “Cette sorte de royauté est à juste titre décrite comme ‘non de ce monde’, puisqu’elle déstabilise les discours de puissance de ce monde. La déposition par Jean de son propos découle de la croix. [...] Ce roi, ce Fils de Dieu est celui qui donne vie en donnant sacrificiellement sa vie, et le propos de Jean est de partager ce message qui est un défi” (179-180). La suite dès lors coule de source.

Le chapitre V: “The Eternal King: Metaphors of Eternal Life and Kingship in John 3” (181-219), rend justice à l’interprétation du royaume en termes de “vie éternelle”, sans porter aucun ombrage à ses enjeux anthropologiques et théologiques. Le chapitre VI: “The Shepherd King: Metaphors of Pastoralism and Kingship in John 9–10” (221-255), souligne à bon escient le lien entre le signe de l’aveugle guéri et son intégration dans la communauté des croyants. Le chapitre VII: “Blessed the King of Israel: the Triumphal Entry and Kingship in John 12 (257-278), se conclut par la mise en évidence du rapport entre: “Groupement de royauté et le ‘Prince de ce monde’” (278). Le chapitre VIII: “The Crucified and Exalted King: Contested Kingship in John 18–19” (279-303), se clôt, quant à lui, par le bel oxymore: “Exaltation in the Cross: Inaugurated Resurrection”. Jésus ressuscite chez Jean dans l’acte où il meurt comme il meurt. Le chapitre IX résume enfin le trajet effectué: “Who is the King of Glory? Im-

plications of Kingship Metaphors in John's Gospel" (305-310). Huit appendices clarifient la présentation de certains développements. La bibliographie témoigne de la somme de travail consentie pour cette recherche personnelle et originale (319-348). Index des auteurs modernes cités, des noms et sujets, comme des anciennes sources honorent la finition de cette grande œuvre.

35 bis, rue de Sèvres
F-75006 Paris

Yves SIMOENS

Dane C. ORTLUND, *Zeal without Knowledge*. The Concept of Zeal in Romans 10, Galatians 1, and Philippians 3 (Library of New Testament Studies 472). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2012. xv-215 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

A study of the concept of zeal in three Pauline texts (Rom 10,2; Gal 1,14; Phil 3,6), in light of the background in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism, is the approach Ortlund uses to enter the ongoing discussion of the "New Perspective on Paul". In this well-researched and concisely argued monograph, a revised version of the author's longer doctoral dissertation defended at Wheaton College under the direction of Douglas Moo, Ortlund's main interlocutor is James Dunn, who has written on Pauline zeal in a number of works over the last three decades. Dunn emphasizes the social and ethnic aspects of zeal (horizontal dimension); e.g., "'zeal' was a burning concern to maintain Israel's identity as a people set apart to God, a passionate concern to protect Israel's holiness over against other nations" (J.D.G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels* [Grand Rapids, MI 2011] 151). Ortlund, in contrast, defends the thesis that zeal is primarily moral and ethical (vertical dimension); it "refers fundamentally to obedience to God and God's law" (169). What is new about Ortlund's contribution is thus his thorough study of the background of zeal carried out in constant dialogue with the New Perspective.

The book has six chapters. After a short introductory chapter (1-5), Ortlund in chapter 2 reviews the recent discussion on Pauline zeal, focusing on several authors associated with the New Perspective or responding to it (6-23). In chapters 3 and 4, he respectively considers the background of zeal in the Old Testament (24-61) and Second Temple Jewish literature (62-114), before turning in chapter 5 to zeal in Paul (115-165). The brief final chapter provides synthesis and conclusions (166-176). There follow a select bibliography of English, German, and French titles (177-195), an index of ancient sources, and an index of names.

The review of scholars' views in chapter 2 clarifies the different nuances of the positions. For example, while Ortlund agrees with Stuhlmacher, Westerholm, and Schreiner in describing zeal primarily as related to obe-

dience, as opposed to Sanders and Dunn who emphasize its ethnic dimension (23), he distances himself from Bultmann's view (echoed somewhat by Stuhlmacher) that the zealous attempt to obey the law is itself sinful (16-19, 136, 170, 172-173). Rather, his view is closer to Westerholm's position of understanding zeal as a positive quality in itself, which however is defective when lacking knowledge (19-20, 170).

In chapter 3, Ortlund carefully studies zeal (זֵאֵל/ζηλ-) in the MT/LXX. Regarding God's zeal/jealousy, he notes how it emerges in the context of the covenant, thus prohibiting idolatry (e.g., Exod 20,5; 34,14). Examples of human zeal are similarly found in contexts in which the covenant is defended against idolatry (Phinehas in Numbers 25; Elijah in 1 Kings 19). Noting that these two concepts of covenant and idolatry are related as "the flipside of the same coin" (45) regarding worship of the true God, Ortlund rightly concludes that zeal in the OT is primarily zeal for God. Such zeal, however, should not be understood individualistically, as the attempt "to establish one's own standing before God" (59), a point on which he is in agreement with Dunn. Nevertheless, he disagrees with Dunn's emphasis on zeal as primarily concerned with guarding Israel's ethnic exclusivity, and thus highlights the counter-example of Saul's zeal against the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21,1-2), which the OT presents negatively (39, 54-55, 59). At the same time, Ortlund insists on retaining "balance" (54), and so he cleverly explains that Old Testament zeal is both vertical and horizontal, "in that order" (61).

Ortlund in chapter 4 thoroughly treats zeal in five bodies of Second Temple Jewish literature: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, and Josephus. Many texts recall OT heroes of zeal (111), such as Phinehas (Sir 45,23), Elijah (Sir 48,1-2), and Simeon and Levi (*Jub* 30,18), while others present more recent examples such as Mattathias (1 Maccabees 2). One impressive contribution in this chapter is Ortlund's extended table of all of the occurrences of the root זֵאֵל in the Dead Sea Scrolls (92-100). Also helpful are his comments in the section on Josephus, distinguishing texts that speak generally of zeal from those that refer to the Zealot party in its revolt against Rome (106-110). Ortlund concludes that zeal is also primarily vertical in the texts of Second Temple Judaism (112), though he notes a shift in emphasis from the OT texts, from zeal for God to zeal for the law (113). While therefore again regarding the more horizontal view of Dunn (and of others such as Garlington, Cummins, and Goodblatt) as inadequate in this regard (113-114), Ortlund strives to present his conclusion in a balanced way, noting that an earlier critique of Dunn's view of zeal (V.M. Smiles, "The Concept of 'Zeal' in Second-Temple Judaism and Paul's Critique of It in Romans 10:2", *CBQ* 64 [2002] 282-299) is too one-sided in the other direction (78, 91, 111-112; see also 4, 54, 168).

In chapter 5, Ortlund turns to zeal in Paul. He focuses mainly on Rom 10,2, where zeal is attributed to Jews (116), and complements this treat-

ment by considering Gal 1,14 and Phil 3,6, where Paul refers to his own pre-Damascus zeal. In all three of these verses, zeal is presented as a positive quality in itself, but one lacking Christian knowledge or revelation. For each verse, Ortlund considers the nature of the zeal described by Paul. He briefly discusses the literary contexts of the verses, provides an exegesis of the corresponding pericopes (Rom 9,30 – 10,3; Gal 1,13-16; Phil 3,4-9), and makes synthetic observations. He concludes that in all three texts, “the denotation [of zeal] is most fundamentally Jewish obedience with respect to God, not Jewish particularism with respect to gentiles” (165). In particular, for Rom 10,2, evidence for this conclusion is the phrase ζήλον θεοῦ, namely “zeal for God” (126), together with the emphasis in Rom 10,3 on the righteousness that comes from God (cf. Phil 3,9) (129-133). Ortlund again strikes a balance between the vertical and horizontal views of zeal, noting that the essence or substance of Paul’s zeal is theological while its form is nationalistic (160, 165).

Ortlund provides some insightful conclusions in chapter 6. Noting that Stendahl’s famous thesis that the pre-Damascus Paul had a robust conscience is basically correct (172-173; cf. 156), he comments that it was precisely Paul’s pre-Damascus zeal, because it was separated from knowledge, that hardened him in his opposition to the gospel. His “was a disobedient obedience” (173). The post-Damascus Paul is not therefore simply converted from his pre-Damascus zeal, as if there were “two ways to live: either with or without zeal” (171), but rather, he now lives a third way, with a zeal transformed by gospel knowledge (cf. Titus 2,14) (172). This is a helpful reflection, and one which Ortlund could have developed further in two ways.

First, regarding transformed zeal, Ortlund could have furthered his argument against Dunn by treating 2 Cor 11,2 (ζηλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζήλω). As many commentators indicate, Paul’s zeal is here not merely “relational ardour or longing” (115), but reflects God’s zeal as manifested in OT covenants (note the marriage imagery). The verse indicates that zeal is indeed something vertical and that it remains in a transformed way after Paul has been converted from his pre-Damascus ethnic exclusivity.

Secondly, regarding his comments that Paul’s zeal without knowledge led to his hardening (173), Ortlund’s treatment of zeal in Paul would have been more complete if he had also treated the four occurrences of παραζηλώω (Rom 10,19; 11,11.14; 1 Cor 10,22), notwithstanding his disclaimer (4) that Richard Bell has already treated this topic (R.H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*. The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11 [WUNT 2.63; Tübingen 1994]). In particular, Paul’s use of παραζηλώω in Rom 10,19 is a citation of Deut 32,21 LXX, where the MT has the same verb נָאָץ generally translated elsewhere as ζηλώω. (Note that Ortlund does discuss Deut 32,21 in his OT chapter [25, 31, 46, 61].) Since the motif of knowledge is also present in Rom 10,19 (134), one would

have expected a more detailed treatment of this verse in his chapter on Paul (especially given his title and subtitle). Moreover, such a treatment could have helped him make the connection between Paul's pre-Damascus hardening stemming from his zeal without knowledge, and Israel's hardening (Rom 11,7) stemming from its zeal without knowledge. In other words, the two further occurrences of παραζηλόω in Rom 11,11.14 deepen Paul's reflection on Deut 32,21, and thus we are arguably dealing throughout Rom 9–11 with one long unit which touches on zeal/jealousy several times in related ways. To wit, in Romans 11 (as everywhere else), zeal without knowledge leads to hardening: “‘to make jealous’ can only mean zeal for the law, which in no way will provoke them to abandon Judaism” (J.-N. Aletti, “Interpreting Romans 11:14: What is at Stake?”, *Celebrating Paul*. FS. J. Murphy-O'Connor – J.A. Fitzmyer [ed. P. Spitaler] [CBQMS 48; Washington, DC 2011] 253). In this way, Ortlund could have treated the concept of zeal more fully, considering not only its nature in Romans 10 (vertical/horizontal) (117), but also its function(s) in Paul's argument in Romans 10–11 (cf. Aletti, “Romans 11:14”, 262-264).

These comments aside, Ortlund's monograph is a model study in many ways, including the disciplined focus of its objectives (3); the methodological care with which it is carried out (25-27, 62-63, 91-92, 116-17); the thoroughness of the research (e.g., 92-100; 108); the clarity and conciseness of the arguments (e.g., 126, 132-133); the fairness with which the author strives to treat his interlocutor (11, 13); and the balance with which he expresses his own conclusions (54; 165; 175-176). Without falling back into old positions or resorting to false dichotomies, Ortlund has indeed offered a helpful critique of the New Perspective, while not neglecting its insights. Through his study of zeal in Paul, he has succeeded in moving the discussion forward.

Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079
U.S.A.

Pablo GADENZ

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaction nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus of Biblica* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutdünken.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

Moloney, Francis J., *The Resurrection of the Messiah*. A Narrative Commentary on the Resurrection Accounts in the Four Gospels. New York – Mahwah, Paulist Press, 2013. xvi-203 p. 15 × 23. \$21.95

Müller, Reinhard – **Pakkala**, Juha – **ter Haar**, Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*. Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible (Resources for Biblical Study 69). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. ix-255 p. 15 × 23

Neufeld, Dietmar, *Mockery and Secretism in the Social World of Mark's Gospel* (Library of New Testament Studies 503). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xiv-204 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

Nicholson, Ernest, *Deuteronomy and the Judaeon Diaspora*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014. xii-196 p. 14 × 22

Parker, Julie Faith, *Valuable and Vulnerable*. Children in the Hebrew Bible especially the Elisha Cycle (Brown Judaic Studies 355). Providence, Rhode Island, Brown University, 2013. xvi-251 p. 16 × 24. \$54.95

Peeler, Amy L. B., *You Are My Son*. The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Library of New Testament Studies 486). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xiv-224 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

Penna, Romano, *Carta a los Romanos*. Introducción, versión y Comentario (Comentarios al Nuevo Testamento). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2013. 1358 p. 16 × 24

Perlitt, Lothar, *Deuteronomium*. 1. Teilband Deuteronomium 1–6 (BKAT V/1). Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener-Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013. ix-485 p. 17 × 24,5. €119.00

Provan, Iain, *Seriously Dangerous Religion*. What the Old Testament Really Says and Why It Matters. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2014. x-502 p. 16 × 23,5

Puig i Tàrrrech, Armand (a cura de), *Pau, fundador del cristianisme?* (Scripta biblica 12). Tarragona, Associació Bíblica de Catalunya, 2012. 199 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Reymond, Eric D., *Qumran Hebrew. An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* (Resources for Biblical Study 76). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xvii-309 p. 15 × 23

Rodríguez, Rafael, *Oral Tradition and the New Testament* (Guides for the Perplexed). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. x-171 p. 14 × 21,5

Schoors, Antoon, *The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Translated by Michael Lesley (Biblical Encyclopedia 5). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xvi-299 p. 15,5 × 23

Schroeder, Joy A., *Deborah's Daughters. Gender Politics and Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014. xiii-359 p. 16 × 24

Seidl, Theodor, "Wacht auf, Harfe und Saitenspiel" (Ps 108,3) Das Alte Testament in Kompositionen des 20. Jahrhunderts (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 95). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 2013. 203 p. 13 × 21

Seitz, Christopher R. – **Richards**, Kent Harold (eds.), *The Bible as Christian Scripture. The Work of Brevard S. Childs* (Biblical Scholarship in North America 25). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xx-326 p. 15,5 × 23

Shepherd, Charles E., *Theological Interpretation and Isaiah 53. A Critical Comparison of Bernhard Duhm, Brevard Childs, and Alec Motyer* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 598). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvi-295 p. 16 × 24

Stancari, Pino, *A partire da Gerusalemme*. Lettera di Giacomo, Lettera di Giuda e Seconda lettera di Pietro. Una lettura spirituale (Bibbia e Preghiera). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2014. 174 p. 14 × 21. €10

Stark, J. David, *Sacred Texts and Paradigmatic Revolutions. The Hermeneutical Worlds of the Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts and the Letter to the Romans* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 16). London – New Delhi – New York, Bloomsbury, 2013. xx-239 p. 16 × 24

Stone, Michael, *Adam and Eve in the Armenian Traditions. Fifth through Seventeenth Centuries* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 38). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. xxii-741 p. 15,5 × 23

Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (SNTU). Serie A (Aufsätze). Band 38. Linz, Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (SNTU). 2013. 274 p. 15 × 23

Trobisch, David, *A User's Guide to the Nestle-Aland 28 Greek New Testament* (Text Critical Studies 9). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2013. viii-69 p. 15 × 23. \$12.95

Tucker, J. Brian – **Baker**, Coleman A. (eds.) *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*. London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvi-657 p. 16 × 24. £110.00

Tyson, Craig W., *The Ammonites. Elites, Empires, and Sociopolitical Change (1000–500 BCE)* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 585). London – New Delhi – New York, Bloomsbury, 2014. xvii-293 p. 16,5 × 24

van der Steen, Eveline – **Boertien**, Jeannette – **Mulder-Hymans**, Noor (eds.), *Exploring the Narrative. Jerusalem and Jordan in the Bronze and Iron Ages* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 583). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2014. xxiv-440 p. 16 × 24

Van Seters, John, *The Yahwist. A Historian of Israelite Origins*. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2013. xvii-380 p. 16 × 23. \$49.50

Vanhoye, Albert, *Le lecture bibliche delle domeniche*. Anno B (Ascolta della Parola). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2014. 369 p. 14 × 21. €20

Vanhoye, Albert, *Le lecture bibliche delle domeniche*. Anno C (Ascolta della Parola). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2014. 374 p. 14 × 21. €20

Vermeulen, Jacques, *Le livre d'Isaïe. Une cathédrale littéraire* (LD 264). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014. 235 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €25

Vine, Cedric E. W., *The Audience of Matthew*. An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis (Library of New Testament Studies 496). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2014. xiv-235 p. 16 × 24

Watts, James W., *Leviticus 1–10* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, Peeters, 2013. xxx-567 p. 16 × 24

Westerholm, Stephen, *Justification Reconsidered*. Rethinking a Pauline Theme. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013. viii-104 p. 14 × 21,5. \$15.00 – £9.99

Whitlark, Jason R. – **Longenecker**, Bruce W. – **Novacovic**, Lidija – **Parsons**, Mikeal C. (eds.), *Interpretation and the Claims of the Text*. Resourcing New Testament Theology. Essays in Honor of Charles H. Talbert. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2014. viii-319 p. 16 × 23,5

Yona, Shamir, *The Many Faces of Repetition*. Basic Patterns of Repetitions in Construct-State Expressions in Biblical, Post-Biblical and Ancient Near-Eastern Rhetoric. Beer-Sheva, Bialik Publishing Co., 2013. 256 p. 16 × 23,5

Zenger, Erich, *I Salmi*. Preghiera e poesia. 1. Col mio Dio scavalco muraglie (Studi biblici 173). Brescia, Paideia, 2013. 203 p. 13,5 × 21. €18

Zenger, Erich, *I Salmi*. Preghiera e poesia. 2. L'aurora voglio destare (Studi biblici 174). Brescia, Paideia, 2013. 237 p. 13,5 × 21. €18,80

Zhao, Yong, *Utter Dark Sayings*. Chinese Insight into Hebrew Bible. S.I., Xulon Press, 2013. 244 p. 15,5 × 23

Zumstein, Jean, *L'évangile selon saint Jean (1–12)* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament IVa). Genève, Labor et Fides, 2014. 423 p. 17,5 × 23,5. €45